

# PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

## Second Annual Convention

OF THE

Industrial Workers of the World

HELD AT CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

SEPT. 17 TO OCT. 3, 1906



UNIVERSITY  
LIBRARY  
PRINCETON

PUBLISHED BY THE  
INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

310 Bush Temple, Chicago, Ill.

1906

---

Stenographically reported by WILSON E. McDERMUT  
and edited in accordance with instructions  
of the Convention.

---

YTHREVMU  
YHARELL  
MOTIONPISN

# PROCEEDINGS

MORNING SESSION, SEPTEMBER 17, 1906.

The convention of the Industrial Workers of the World was called to order at 10 a. m. by President Sherman. The call for the convention was read by Secretary Trautmann. President Sherman then announced the appointment of a credentials committee of seven.

J. J. Kinneally, New York, moved that a credentials committee of five be elected by the body. Motion was seconded.

The President declared the motion out of order. An appeal was taken from the decision of the chair. President Sherman refused to entertain the appeal, and proceeded to appoint a committee of seven as follows: Wm. Keogh, Lillian Forberg, John McMullen, L. M. Kohl, A. Maichele, Max Hendricks, F. W. Cronin.

The President at 10:20 a. m. declared the convention adjourned until 2 p. m.

AFTERNOON SESSION, SEPTEMBER 17.

The delegates were called to order by President Sherman at 2 p. m. The Credentials Committee reported progress, informing the delegates that a report would not be made probably until Tuesday morning.

I. Shenkan moved that the Committee on Credentials be instructed to get an itemized report of locals entitled to representation, with the names of their duly accredited delegates, and then bring in a separate report on the basis of representation. Motion was seconded and carried.

Daniel DeLeon offered the following resolution:

RESOLVED, That when the committee on credentials reports, the convention shall organize with those delegates that the Committee reports favorably upon, except those against whom objection may be raised by the delegates reported favorably upon; and that as to the delegates reported upon adversely and those delegates reported upon favorably but objected to by the delegates seated, their cases be taken up seriatim by the organized convention. The resolution was adopted.

Phillip Veal moved that we meet tomorrow (Tuesday) morning at Brand's Hall.

I. Shenkan offered an amendment that in view of objections raised to Brand's Hall, a committee constituted of Industrial Workers of the World members in Chicago be delegated to find another hall. An amendment was offered that we meet at Brand's Hall, Tuesday morning at 8 o'clock. The amendment to the amendment carried, 55 aye, 3 no. DeLeon voted no, explaining that he did so because of the uncertainty that Brand's Hall could be had for longer than nine days.

E. R. Markley moved that all available Industrial Workers of the World speakers be utilized at public meetings while the convention

HJ 8055  
I5A2 (RECAP) 141914 308151  
1-2

lasts. Motion was seconded and carried. The delegates then adjourned to meet at Brand's Hall at 8 o'clock Tuesday morning.

### TUESDAY MORNING, SEPTEMBER 18.

The delegates convened at Brand's Hall, Tuesday morning. President Sherman in the chair. The following telegrams were read:

From Eugene V. Debs—"Hearty congratulations to the Industrial Workers of the World and success to their deliberations."

From W. F. Davis, Goldfield, Nev.—"While not with you in person, I am with you in thought. Liberty and justice for Moyer, Haywood and Pettibone."

From the Excelsior Educational Society, Edw. I. Polster, Secretary, New York City—"We congratulate the second annual convention of the Industrial Workers of the World. The past year has proven that the capitalist class finds a worthy foe in the Industrial Workers of the World. We hope the good work will continue many years and Industrial Workers of the World conventions held until wage slavery is abolished."

Upon motion a temporary sergeant-at-arms was appointed by the chair.

It was moved and seconded that inasmuch as the Credentials Committee was not ready to report the delegates adjourn to call on arrival of the Committee. Carried.

At 10:45 the delegates were called to order and the Credentials Committee reported through its secretary, John McMullen.

The report being read it was moved and seconded that it be received and concurred in.

An amendment was offered seating those delegates favorably reported upon, provided nothing thereby conflicts with the resolution adopted yesterday.

After discussion the amendment was adopted upon a roll call of those delegates favorably reported upon and the convention organized by the seating of the following delegates, the vote on the amendment standing 542 for, and 3 against:

George Abbott .....	11	A. Lingenfelter .....	1
Geo. S. Holmes .....	3	Fred W. Haver .....	5
Max Hendricks .....	3	Jas. M. Reid .....	1
W. J. Hannemann .....	1	E. J. Foote .....	2
A. L. Smith .....	1	D. Gilchrist .....	1
James Kelly .....	2	C. H. Duncan .....	1
Wm. Ahern .....	3	A. J. Hawkins .....	1
— Daniel De Leon .....	5	Wm. O'Donnell .....	1
Sigmond Moskowitz .....	5	A. L. McIntosh .....	1
— J. W. Johnson .....	2	— Wade Parks .....	1
— F. P. Cranston .....	1	H. Nordholdt .....	1
Jas. M. Brown .....	15	— Sam J. French .....	7
Fred Dressler .....	1	H. J. Juergens .....	1
W. W. Cox .....	1	— Jno. R. Robinson .....	1
— Lillian Forberg .....	1	Walter J. Rogers .....	1
F. W. Kleese .....	2	E. U. Lundy .....	1
Jas. Motherwell .....	2	Wm. McCue .....	1
Paul Augustine .....	1	Fred G. Moore .....	1
Eugene Fischer .....	2	Fred W. Heslewood .....	1
Wm. Keogh .....	3	Teofilo Petriella .....	1
Jas. Rugg .....	1	A. Bohling .....	1
Donald McKnight .....	2	Jno. McMullen .....	108



E. R. Markley	1	P. R. McDonald	109
Herman Richter	2	Vincent St. John	109
Walter Goss	1	Albert Ryan	109
Albert Simpson	1	John Riordan	1
I. Shenkan	2	Frank McCabe	1
Philip Veal	1	C. G. Kirkpatrick	1
Michael Dumas	3½	F. W. Cronin	1
Jos. Mullady	3½	C. H. Mahoney	1
Lazarus Goldberg	1	W. E. Trautmann	1
Ludwig Ginther	2	Chas. O. Sherman	1

Exceptions were taken to seating delegates from the Transportation department and the Metal and Machinery department.

On motion an adjournment was taken until 3 p. m. to enable the credentials committee to make a report on all contested cases.

#### AFTERNOON SESSION, SEPTEMBER 18.

The convention was called to order at 2 o'clock. President Sherman in the chair.

Delegate DeLeon moved that the committee on credentials be instructed to adjourn its meeting forthwith, that its members appear on the convention floor, the convention then to constitute itself into a committee of the whole and take up the contests, beginning with that of the metal workers.

Discussion followed and upon a roll call the motion was carried by a vote of 315 yes, 118 no.

It was moved and seconded that a stenographer be employed to take a stenographic report of the convention proceedings.

Upon roll call the motion was lost—yes, 185½; no, 366½.

Moved and seconded that the secretary be instructed to send a telegram expressing the confidence of this convention in Brothers Moyer, Haywood and Pettibone, now illegally confined at Boise, Idaho.

Amendment was offered that a committee of three be appointed to draft a suitable message.

The amendment prevailed and the chair appointed as such committee Daniel DeLeon, Vincent St. John and W. E. Trautmann.

The credentials committee made a supplementary report upon which the following delegates were regularly seated: Jas. Dial, one vote; Sol. Rotkowitz, one vote; J. J. Kinneally, one vote; W. R. Fox, two votes; Jas. M. Brown, three votes; Max Eisenberg, one vote; Oscar Olsen, one vote.

The delegates, being in committee of the whole, then took up the contests.

Objections having been raised against seating the delegate from the Metal and Machinery department, on the ground that the department never was legally organized, Delegate Kirkpatrick moved that the protest against seating the Metal and Machinery department delegate be presented in writing. Motion seconded.

Delegate DeLeon offered as a substitute motion that the protesting delegates be called upon to take the floor, each to occupy not more than five minutes in stating his case.

The vote being on the substitute motion, it was carried. Yes, 552; no, 2.

The case of the protestants was presented by W. E. Tullar, P. Schweinberg, Chicago; Hauck, Buffalo, N. Y.; H. Richter, Detroit, Mich.; Nyhoff, Pullman, Ill.; and A. Maichele, Schenectady, N. Y., delegate-elect of the Metal and Machinery department, who said he came to

the convention representing the consensus of opinion in Schenectady that there was no properly constituted Metal and Machinery department.

Delegates R. T. Sims, Daniel DeLeon and others spoke in support of the protestants.

Delegates Chas. O. Sherman (Vincent St. John being in the chair), C. G. Kirkpatrick and F. McCabe spoke in defense of the Metal and Machinery department.

Delegate DeLeon moved that the contesting delegates be seated and that each has the vote to which he may be found by the credentials committee to be entitled, such vote to be deducted from the votes which the department delegate has. Motion seconded.

At 8:15 a motion to adjourn was lost—yes, 150; no, 291.

Delegate Moore moved to amend the motion that the delegate from Schenectady representing the locals of that city be seated, and that the contestants be seated and represent the locals to which they belong. Amendment seconded.

Delegate Hannemann offered a substitute motion that we seat the regular delegate of the Metal and Machinery department and that a committee of three be appointed to investigate the conditions in the Metal and Machinery department and report to the convention. Seconded.

A vote being taken on the substitute motion it was declared lost—yes, 252; no, 306.

The vote on the amendment stood 3 for and 545 against.

The original motion was then carried by a vote of 306½ for, 243 against.

At 8:45 p. m. the committee adjourned until 9 a. m. Wednesday.

#### MORNING SESSION, SEPTEMBER 19.

The delegates assembled in committee of the whole at 9 a. m. President Sherman in the chair. After roll call it was moved and seconded to adjourn to give the contestants in the Metal and Machinery department an opportunity to establish their standing with the credentials committee.

The motion was carried—yes, 373; no, 173.

The committee appointed to draft a message to Moyer, Haywood and Pettibone reported the following:

“Chicago, Sept. 19, 1906.

“Messrs. Moyer, Haywood and Pettibone,

“Ada County Jail, Boise, Idaho:

“Comrades—Industrial Workers of the World in convention assembled send greetings and regret that capitalist conspiracies prevent your being with us in the greatest revolutionary working class convention ever held on the American continent, strictly in line with last year’s convention.

DANIEL DE LEON,  
W. E. TRAUTMANN,  
VINCENT ST. JOHN,  
Committee.”

The report was adopted unanimously.

The committee then adjourned.

#### AFTERNOON SESSION, SEPTEMBER 19.

The delegates reassembled in committee of the whole at 1:50 p. m. The credentials committee reported the following entitled to seats:

W. E. Tullar, one vote; Albert Schultz, one vote; Paul Schweinberg, three votes; Jos. Hammerle, one vote; Hugo Huese, three votes; Wm. Rice, one vote; Henry Petzolt, one vote; Emanuel Hauck, one vote; Herman Richter, one vote; S. Moskowitz, one vote; Henry V. Jackson, eight votes; Nora B. Spear, one vote; A. Maichele, thirty-six votes; Ulrich Frueh, three votes.

It was moved by Delegate Kleese, and seconded that the report be accepted and the delegates seated. Carried.

Moved and seconded that R. T. Sims be seated as a delegate representing the Metal and Machinery Local of Milwaukee and two other locals. Carried by a vote of 343, against 260.

Objection was raised to seating the delegate from the Transportation department by Delegate Riordan in the following resolution:

WHEREAS, The so-called Transportation Department of the Industrial Workers of the World exists in name only, as the accounts of that organization show, and

WHEREAS, The affairs of said organization are conducted in open defiance of the principles governing the Industrial Workers of the World so much that even the mandates of the Executive Board of the Industrial Workers of the World were disregarded. Therefore be it

RESOLVED, That this convention refuses to recognize said department as a legitimate part of the Industrial Workers of the World, and also refuses to recognize the credential of the delegate from that department, or the representative on the General Executive Board of the Industrial Workers of the World representing said department. And be it further

RESOLVED, That the credentials of all local unions of transportation workers who are sending delegates be recognized, and the delegates seated.

Delegate Tullar moved that the contestants and representatives of the Transportation department be given the floor to state their case.

Motion carried—yes, 619; no, 2.

The case of the protesting members of the Transportation department was presented by Wm. Hickey, Chicago; W. J. Pinkerton, Blue Island, Ill.; John Plummer, Hammond, Ind.; J. E. Fitzgerald, San Antonio, Texas; T. J. Cole, Blue Island, Ill.; and W. L. Hall, Chicago. The contention was that they were suspended while in good standing, that the former secretary-treasurer had never resigned, and that the present secretary-treasurer had never been legally elected.

The case of the contestees was presented by F. M. McCabe and L. M. Kohl.

At 6 p. m. the committee adjourned to 9 a. m. Thursday.

#### MORNING SESSION, SEPTEMBER 20.

The delegates met in committee of the whole at 9:25. President Sherman in the chair.

The chair announced the continuation of the case in the Transportation department.

Several delegates and contestants took the floor. McCabe presented his case.

Delegate Sherman said he had plead with McCabe to call a convention of the department and allow the affair to be thoroughly investigated and prevent it coming before this convention. McCabe refused because the membership was so small.

At 12:35 the committee adjourned to meet at 1:45 p. m.

## AFTERNOON SESSION, SEPTEMBER 20.

The delegates met in committee of the whole at 1:50 p. m. President Sherman in the chair.

McCabe and Kohl presented their case.

Delegate DeLeon moved that the matter containing the resolution introduced by Delegate Riordan be divided into two questions: First, shall the contestants be seated? Second, shall the elected delegate of the Transportation department be seated?

Motion seconded by Delegate McMullen.

No objection was made to the division of the question.

Delegate DeLeon reviewed at length the evidence submitted.

An amendment to refer the matter back to the credentials committee was ruled out of order.

At 6 p. m. the committee adjourned.

## MORNING SESSION, SEPTEMBER 21.

The delegates re-assembled in committee of the whole at 9 o'clock. President Sherman in the chair stated the case of the Transportation department was re-opened and McCabe by agreement presented additional testimony. Other delegates spoke in behalf of the Transportation department.

At this point in the proceedings a telegram was received from the Cloth Hat and Cap Workers of New York and read.

McCabe in reply to questions admitted that local unions No. 7, 1 and 12 were in good standing when they were suspended, and that they were suspended because they would not recognize Kohl as secretary-treasurer.

Delegate Sherman on the floor admitted he had denied the contestants an appeal.

At 1 o'clock the committee adjourned.

## AFTERNOON SESSION, SEPTEMBER 21.

In committee of the whole the delegates re-convened at 1 p. m.

L. M. Kohl again took the floor to present additional testimony in behalf of the Transportation department.

McCabe being called upon to produce the letter of resignation as secretary-treasurer alleged to have been written by Hall, did not do so.

The previous question was moved and lost by vote of 432 against 29.

No objection being raised to dividing the Riordan resolution into two parts, Delegate DeLeon moved that the contestants be seated except such of them as the convention may ascertain were not in good standing at the time the Hall-Kohl trouble arose—seconded.

Delegate Hannemann amended that all delegates of local unions of the Transportation department with credentials be seated, provided that they show their cards in good standing, and that the locals are in good standing in the I. W. W., the convention to decide their good standing.

A delegate moved to lay the amendment on the table. Seconded.

Motion declared out of order.

Delegate DeLeon's motion was then carried, the vote standing 379 for. 246 against.

Delegate DeLeon moved that the contestee, L. M. Kohl, be seated with the vote of the locals that he represents. Seconded.

Delegate Sherman amended, that L. M. Kohl be seated as delegate from the Transportation department. Seconded.

Delegate DeLeon withdrew his motion and the amendment, being

then an original motion, was carried by unanimous consent, seating Kohl.

At 5:35 p. m. the committee adjourned to meet at 9 a. m. Saturday.

#### MORNING SESSION.—SEPT. 22.

Delegates called to order at 9:15 a. m. President Sherman in the chair. Roll called.

The following protest was introduced by Delegate Augustine:  
To the Delegates of the Second National Convention of the Industrial Workers of the World:

In accordance with instructions from Local Union No. 95, Building Trades Industrial Union, which I represent, I hereby protest against the seating of Daniel McKinnon, representing Local Union No. 370. on the ground that the local he represents is a local union irregularly chartered after August 1, 1906.

Delegate Augustine supported the protest. He held that if the local was chartered prior to July 31, then it is entitled, under the call, to representation; but if the charter was issued after July 31, the local is not eligible to representation. The charter was issued after August 1, 1906.

Delegate Augustine was supported by Delegates French, Fischer and Moskowitz.

Delegate Sherman spoke in favor of seating McKinnon. He said he signed the charter for the purpose of bringing a test case before the convention.

After much discussion Delegate Augustine offered to withdraw the protest and allow the claimant to be seated.

Objection was made and the committee adjourned to meet at 1:30 p. m.

#### AFTERNOON SESSION.—SEPT. 22.

The committee of the whole reconvened at 1:30. President Sherman in the chair.

Delegate Gilchrist, of Pittsburg, moved to elect a new chairman. The motion being declared out of order and an appeal taken, the appeal was declared lost, whereupon Delegate Gilchrist withdrew from the committee.

Delegate Moore, of Chicago, also withdrew from the committee.

Delegate Augustine again offered to withdraw the protest against seating McKinnon, and was supported by Delegate DeLeon.

Delegate Hannemann objected.

Moved and seconded that McKinnon be seated with the votes he is entitled to. Motion carried; three votes in the negative.

Delegate DeLeon moved that this committee of the whole now rise and that the Secretary report to the convention the proceedings and recommendations of the committee. Motion seconded.

The motion was carried. Vote—yes, 369; no, 127.

The Secretary having reported to the convention, Delegate DeLeon moved that the report of the whole be taken up seriatim. Seconded.

Objection was made to the motion. The chair declared the motion in order.

An appeal was taken from the decision of the chair. The chair was sustained. Vote—Yes, 363½; no, 254.

Delegate Mahoney moved that all of the questions reported by the Secretary of the committee of the whole be taken up seriatim. Seconded.

Moved and seconded to lay the motion on the table. Carried. Vote—Yes, 384; no, 245.

A vote on the motion by Delegate DeLeon was then taken and it was carried. Vote—Yes, 382; no, 236.

Delegate DeLeon moved that the following standing committees be immediately provided for, to be appointed by the chairman of the convention, with the consent of the house. On Rules, three members; on Constitution, five members; on Resolutions, five members; on investigating the status of the locals from the Transportation department whom the convention has seated, three members. Motion seconded.

Amended, that the Committee on Constitution be stricken out. Amendment seconded.

A motion to lay the amendment on the table was lost. Vote—Yes, 143; no, 476.

The vote being on the amendment it was carried. Vote—Yes, 423; no, 202.

Moved and seconded to adjourn to meet at 9 a. m. Sunday.

Amended, to strike out Sunday and insert Monday. Seconded.

Amendment lost. Vote—Yes, 271; no, 350.

Chairman Sherman ruled debate on the original motion in order.

An appeal being taken the chair was not sustained. Vote—Yes, 140; No. 359½.

Vote on original motion—Yes, 262½; no, 247.

The convention then adjourned to meet Sunday morning at 9 o'clock.

#### MORNING SESSION.—SEPT. 23.

The convention was called to order by President Sherman at 9:15.

By unanimous consent the motion by Delegate DeLeon, as amended, was carried.

The chairman announced the committees as follows:

Committee on Rules.—E. R. McDonald, Geo. Abbott, W. J. Hannemann.

Committee on Resolutions.—Max Hendricks, Paul Augustine, Wm. Kehoe, Albert Ryan, Albert Lingenfelter.

Committee to Investigate Status of Delegates from Transportation Department.—Daniel DeLeon, Vincent St. John, C. H. Duncan.

Delegate DeLeon moved to strike out the name of McDonald from the committee on rules and put W. R. Fox in its place; to strike out the name of Hannemann and insert the name of F. W. Kleese in its place. Motion seconded.

Vote to strike out McDonald and insert W. R. Fox was lost by a vote of 240 yes, and 268 no.

Vote to strike out Hannemann and insert Kleese carried. Vote—Yes, 357; no, 262.

Delegate DeLeon moved to make Augustine first on committee on resolutions and Hendricks second. Motion seconded.

After discussion Delegate DeLeon offered to withdraw his motion.

The chair ruled withdrawal out of order. On appeal the chair was sustained. Vote—Yes, 264; no, 245.

It was moved that the motion be laid on the table. Motion seconded. Vote—Yes, 492; no, 120.

With the unanimous consent of the house Delegate Fox was substituted for Delegate DeLeon on the Transportation department committee.

Delegate St. John withdrew his name from the same committee and

with the consent of the house Delegate Parkes was appointed in his place.

The committee on Transportation department delegates, as finally composed, was as follows: W. R. Fox, Wade Parkes, C. H. Duncan.

Delegate DeLeon moved that the convention proceed to elect a committee on constitution to consist of six members, and that when the delegates from the Musical unions are seated they be allowed to select a representative on the committee. Motion seconded.

Amended by Delegate Richter that the whole committee of seven be elected—by the house. Amendment seconded.

Adjourned to meet at 1:45 p. m.

#### AFTERNOON SESSION.—SEPT. 23.

Convention was called to order at 2 o'clock.

A vote being taken on Delegate Richter's amendment it was lost. Vote—Yes, 50; no, 543.

A vote was then taken on the original motion and it was carried. Vote—Yes, 386; no, 222.

Nominations were made for the committee on constitution as follows: Daniel DeLeon, J. J. Kinneally, Vincent St. John, A. Maichele, D. McKinnon, E. J. Foote, L. M. Kohl.

Delegate Kohl withdrew, and by unanimous consent the following were declared elected as the committee on constitution: Delegates DeLeon, Kinneally, St. John, Maichele, McKinnon and Foote.

B. Stone, representing Local No. 158, Chicago, was seated with one vote.

Delegate Kehoe moved that W. T. Leach, representing Local Union No. 229, of Montreal, Canada, be seated upon the promise that the dues of the local shall be paid upon his return to Montreal.

The motion was seconded and passed with unanimous consent and the delegate seated with one vote.

In the case of the Musical Unions, Nos. 23 and 41, J. Schomberg was seated with ten votes.

Delegate Duncan moved to renew the motion to employ a stenographer to take the proceedings of the convention and that the report be published in book form. Motion seconded and adopted unanimously.

Moved that the Secretary be instructed to employ a stenographer. Carried unanimously.

Adjourned to 9 a. m. Monday.

[The Stenographic Report, provided for in the last session, begins with the sessions of Monday, September 24.]

## EIGHTH DAY.

MONDAY, SEPT. 24, 1906.—MORNING SESSION.

PRESIDENT SHERMAN called the Convention to order at 9:20.

The roll of members was called by the secretary.

THE PRESIDENT: The next in order will be the reading of the minutes of the previous meeting. I would suggest, however, owing to the fact that we have minutes for two or three sessions that have not been read. I believe it would be in order this morning to read all of the minutes that have not been read. If there are no objections I will so order the secretary.

The minutes of the sessions from Sept. 17th to Sept. 23d inclusive were read by the secretary.

You have heard the reading of the minutes. What is your pleasure?

DEL. McMULLEN: I desire to offer a correction.

THE CHAIRMAN: What is your correction?

DEL. McMULLEN: At the morning session of the 18th a protest was received from No. 95 concerning No. 370. Right after the credential committee reported the first protest received of any kind was from Delegate—I believe it was from 95, was it not?—concerning the seating of 370 of New York. There is no mention at all in there of that fact.

THE CHAIRMAN: If there is no mention of that fact—

DEL. McMULLEN: I am offering it as a correction because it occurred in the business here. Now again, in the matter of the Transportation Department, I believe you recollect Del. McCabe was up here. Del. McCabe is made to say by these minutes that he admitted that these several locals were in good standing. His distinct and explicit statement here was that they were suspended for non-payment of dues. Now, these minutes go out broadcast as the proceedings of this convention. This man should not be made to say a thing that he distinctly asserted the contrary of. Now, again, when these delegates withdrew here, the delegate that withdrew offered a motion to proceed to elect a new chairman, and the same was defeated, and he announced his withdrawal on that reason. There is no record whatever of that motion, at all, but there is a record of his withdrawal. You recall the fact, my brother, is not that so?

DEL. LINGENFELTER: Was that Del. Gilchrist of Pittsburg?

DEL. McMULLEN: I believe it was. I cannot remember the name, but that was the fact, however.

DEL. KLEESE: You are right.

SECRETARY TRAUTMANN: It is recorded that he withdrew from the Convention.

DEL. McMULLEN: I know. It is not recorded that after that some one made a motion to appoint a new chairman.

SECRETARY TRAUTMANN: That was defeated.

DEL. McMULLEN: Yes, that was defeated.

SECRETARY TRAUTMANN: Or rather not entertained at all.

DEL. McMULLEN: I know, but there was an appeal from the decision of the chair.

SECRETARY TRAUTMANN: Yes.

DEL. McMULLEN: And the decision was lost. Do you recall that?

SECRETARY TRAUTMANN: That is right.

DEL. McMULLEN: It is, exactly, is it not, brother?

SECRETARY TRAUTMANN: That is right.

DEL. McMULLEN: I only ask that these corrections be made, to show just what took place. I have no objections to anything that is



a fact, but I do not want McCabe to be made to say things here that he positively denied, because McCabe said just what I stated to you. I ask that those corrections be inserted.

DEL. SIMS: Mr. Chairman, I wish to take exception to one correction that Del. McMullen made in regard to the admission of McCabe as to the standing of locals in the Transportation Department. He absolutely admitted on the floor to Del. De Leon, that this local from San Antonio and local No. 5, I believe, and No. 1 of Chicago, and, if I am not mistaken, also one or two other locals, with the exception of one local which was not contested here—that they were in good standing up to the time of the Hall-Kohl controversy, and that they were suspended because they refused to recognize Kohl as general secretary of the Transportation Department; that they were in good standing up to the time of that controversy, while it seems to be attempted now to convey the idea by Del. McMullen's assertion that they were suspended because of non-payment of dues, and were not in good standing. And I wish to take exception to and deny that, on behalf of the Transportation locals which refused to accept autocratic measures being introduced in regard to the Secretary-Treasurer.

DEL. McCABE: Mr. Chairman, the books are here. The ledger that was left in the office by Brother Hall is still there, and it shows for itself that those locals, some of them, were in bad standing for the months of October and November. I don't say all. Some of the others received stamps in the month of November and refused to pay for them. Therefore I consider them in bad standing.

DEL. SMITH: A point of order. We are not taking evidence now. This matter pertains to what was stated on this floor, and that brother did distinctly say what the minutes say. I just merely want to coincide in the other corrections that Bro. McMullen has stated here.

DEL. McCABE: I have plenty to attend to besides replying to those who are sticking a knife in me every time they get a chance, and I am getting tired of it.

DEL. FOX: I distinctly heard Bro. McCabe admit that No. 1 and No. 12 and No. 7 were in good standing at the time of this controversy.

DEL. DE LEON: A point of order. No motion has been made, and this discussion is out of order.

DEL. McMULLEN: Let me ask one question. Is this the official stenographer that is working this morning?

ASST. SEC. EDWARDS: Yes.

DEL. DE LEON: Yes. My point of order is that this discussion is not on any motion. There is a discussion instead of rising here and making a motion. The way to do it is to make a motion to make a correction of the minutes.

THE CHAIRMAN: The point of order is well taken. You have heard the reading of the minutes; what is your pleasure?

DEL. SMITH: I move to adopt the minutes as corrected.

DEL. DE LEON: Seconded.

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded that we adopt the minutes as corrected. Are you ready for the question?

DEL. McMULLEN: With these corrections?

THE CHAIRMAN: With the corrections that have been taken down, I understand.

DEL. McCABE: Not only with the corrections that have been made now, but with the others?

THE CHAIRMAN: I should judge there didn't seem to be any objection when the other changes were made, and for that reason I would take it for granted that by mutual consent the other changes would come in the minutes.

DEL. McMULLEN: Do I understand that in making those corrections the utterances will appear in the official report? I maintain that what I stated was a fact, as to the McCabe affair.

THE CHAIRMAN: I suppose the brother has taken it down here.

DEL. McMULLEN: All right, sir.

DEL. SMITH: Mr. President, do you understand my motion?

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded that the minutes be endorsed as corrected and read.

DEL. SMITH: Now, that is not clear at all. As corrected previously, but not as corrected now.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, everything corrected; that correction has not gone in there yet, brother. I think I am safe in stating "as read and corrected."

DEL. SMITH: That is right.

THE CHAIRMAN: And the only correction I know of that is on record is as to the McCabe affair.

DEL. DE LEON: In view of the fact that objection has been raised to that part of the minutes relating to the McCabe affair, I wish to say that McCabe's statement was made. I asked Brother McCabe a number of questions, and in answer he distinctly admitted that No. 7 of San Antonio, No. 1 of Chicago and No. 12 of Hammond, Ind., were in good standing at the time of the Hall-Kohl controversy, or when the Hall-Kohl controversy began, and that the only local that he insisted was in bad standing at the time was Local Blue Island. I think McCabe said that, according to my recollection, in his answer to my question.

DEL. McMULLEN: Do you recall—just listen to this one second—didn't McCabe distinctly state on this floor—I am trying to refresh your mind now—you recall he read a letter showing that meetings were held in someone's house and that there were three members there? Now it would be impossible for such a local to be in good standing. That claim could not be asserted. That letter came from a gentleman who was a protestant; I forget his name; Fitzgerald, I believe. Yes, Fitzgerald was the person who signed that communication.

DEL. DE LEON: On the question being asked Mr. McCabe, you distinctly recollect that McCabe read here what purported to be a letter and said there were charges in this case, and the document was not presented to us. You cannot judge as to whether all of that letter was read or otherwise. But I was trying to take a short cut across lots and asked him directly for his conclusions, and his conclusions were that the San Antonio Local was in good standing and No. 9 of Chicago was in good standing, and Hammond, Ind., was in good standing, but that Blue Island was not.

DEL. FOX: The books of that department do show that San Antonio Local paid over \$36 into their treasury, and could not be in bad standing.

DEL. SMITH: Question.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question has been called for. Are you ready for the question? Call the roll, Mr. Secretary, if there is no objection.

DEL. KLEESE: Let us hear it read as corrected.

THE CHAIRMAN: I don't know what you say.

DEL. KLEESE: Wouldn't it be best to hear the minutes as corrected?

THE CHAIRMAN: Will you read this correction, Bro. Secretary?

THE SECRETARY (reading): "Morning session, Sept. 23. Cor-

rection made: After the motion made by Del. De Leon to strike out the name of Hannemann and insert the name of F. W. Kleese in its place. Motion was seconded. By unanimous consent of convention motion was divided and vote to strike out McDonald and insert W. R. Fox was lost by a vote of 240 yes, 268 no.

"The next correction to be made was to insert the full letter and statement of protestants against McKinnon of New York in the minutes, instead of a brief notice."

DEL. McKINNON: That is to put that—

SEC. TRAUTMANN: That the full letter of the protestants be inserted in the minutes.

DEL. McKINNON: But on that date, Tuesday, the 18th, morning session.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: On Tuesday, the 18th, morning session?

DEL. McKINNON: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is that satisfactory to the convention?

DEL. McCABE: Mr. Chairman, if I understand correctly—I might be mistaken—I don't see anything in there where there were two or three motions made here yesterday and I think there were two appeals from the decision of the chair, and I would like to be clear on that point. I would like to see that those were inserted in the minutes. If we are going to have one thing picked out and picked to pieces let us pick them all. I want to have the minutes read agam, to be clear on that point.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yesterday's minutes?

DEL. KLEESE: There were several instances where appeals were taken from the decisions of the chair. They are not recorded and they were unnecessary, because they do not affect the revolutionary movement of the working class. They are just to take time.

DEL. McCABE: I would like to hear the minutes of yesterday's proceedings read, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: The delegate will be accommodated. It will only take a minute.

The following was read from the minutes of the session of September 23:

"Convention was called to order at 2 o'clock.

"A vote being taken on Delegate Richter's amendment it was lost. Vote—Yes, 50; no, 543.

"A vote was then taken on the original motion and it was carried. Vote—Yes, 386; no, 222.

"Nominations were made for the committee on constitution as follows: Daniel De Leon, J. J. Kinneally, Vincent St. John, A. Maichele, D. McKinnon, E. J. Foote, L. M. Kohl.

"Delegate Kohl withdrew, and by unanimous consent the following were declared elected as the committee on constitution: Delegates De Leon, Kinneally, St. John, Maichele, McKinnon and Foote."

DEL. HANNEMANN: There is something that I think is quite necessary to get down in those minutes. There was a motion made to seat those delegates of the Musical Union with one vote, and there was a substitute made to that motion, made by Brother Sherman, and there was an appeal taken from the chair and the decision of the chair was upheld. I do not see that in the minutes.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: That is in there.

DEL. McCABE: That is the point I wanted to bring out.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: The correction will be made.

DEL. McMULLEN: There was a roll call on that appeal.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Yes.

DEL. McCABE: Now, if I am in order, I wish to bring out this point at this place, that any time that some prominent delegate makes a motion here and it is duly seconded and not carried, there is a rule that they generally appeal from the chair, if they want to make a motion and it is ruled out of order or something of the kind. Now I say whether it is carried or defeated, let us have it on the minutes and in the record, and I am going to insist on that.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair would like to say this, that he is as responsible as any individual delegate here for our not having a full report of all our proceedings. The Chair realizes that it is very hard for the Secretary to take down in longhand every move during a meeting such as we have had. If there is no objection the Chair will rule that these minutes are endorsed by unanimous consent.

DEL. McKINNON: Mr. Chairman, as the Committee on Constitution is not ready to report—

THE CHAIRMAN: You had better wait till they report.

DEL. McKINNON: Mr. Chairman, as the Committee on Constitution has not completed its report—

A DELEGATE: Turn around and talk to the delegates.

DEL. McKINNON: I am talking to the convention. If you make a little less noise you may be able to hear. As the Committee on Constitution has not completed its report, I move that Brother Schomberg be the seventh member of that committee, subject to the decision of the convention.

THE CHAIRMAN: I don't believe it requires a motion. Provision has been made for a Musicians' representative. Would there be any objection to his being endorsed unanimously?

No objection was heard.

DEL. PARKS: I move that we now hear the report of the Committee on Rules and Order of Business.

DEL. LINGENFELTER: I second the motion.

DEL. PARKS: That is the first thing to come up.

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded that we hear the report of the Committee on Rules and Order of Business. Are you ready for the question?

DEL. MAHONEY: Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to the motion. The motion, in my opinion, is proper. I believe that should be one of the first committees to report. But we have on the floor of this convention delegates who have been seated, whose vote has not been designated, and by not acting or hearing the report of your special committee on the designation of the vote of the Transportation department and of your Credential Committee on the designation of the vote of the Musicians, you are depriving them of a vote on every motion that is made before that time. I am of the opinion that the reports of these committees will be accepted immediately and their names placed on the roll, giving them a full voting right in this convention. That is the only suggestion that I have got to make, and I believe it would have been proper had this been taken up before.

DEL. PARKS: Now, Mr. Chairman, I consider that Bro. Mahoney's suggestions are very good, but the Committee on Status of the Transportation department, of which I am one of the members, have gone over the matter in hand. Our secretary is formulating our report. We are not just ready to report right now, but I will say that I will withdraw the motion that I have made, with the consent of the second, providing that we discover that we can dispose of both matters within fifteen minutes from the time that the reports of the two committees

are submitted. But if it develops that we cannot dispose of them and the convention is going to be thrown back upon the general question, I believe we ought to have some rules; and with the understanding that the reports of these committees go through and these delegates are seated within fifteen minutes according to the reports of our committees, I will withdraw this question at this time.

THE CHAIRMAN: What does the second say?

DEL. LINGENFELTER: I will accept that.

#### ABSENTEES AND PROXIES.

THE CHAIRMAN: If there is nothing before the house the Chair would like to make an announcement. Delegate Mrs. Spear asked me last night if I had any objection to her leaving her vote with a proxy, as she had been called home. I said that personally I had none, and that if she would leave word as to whom she wanted her vote turned over to, that I would announce the same in the morning, and I desire to make this announcement at her request. Mrs. Spear asked that Philip Veal be allowed to cast her vote for the remainder of this convention. Is there any objection?

A DELEGATE: None.

THE CHAIRMAN: If there is no objection—

DEL. HANNEMANN: I believe that is not the way to do it. I believe the delegate should go back to her local and ask the local to elect somebody to represent it at this convention. That would be the proper way to act in cases of those who go away. If it is done by the consent of their organization, if the selection is made that way, then I think that is the proper course to take.

DEL. DUNCAN: I have a suggestion to make on this subject. I move that we instruct our secretary to at once notify by wire all locals whose delegates have withdrawn from this convention, that they have withdrawn, and to send others.

DEL. McMULLEN: I would second that motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded that the secretary be instructed to notify by wire all local unions whose delegates have withdrawn from this convention. Are you ready for the question?

DEL. RIORDAN: I wish at this time to make a motion to lay that motion on the table and move that the request be granted and that the credential or proxy be given to the selection by the delegate who wishes to withdraw from the convention. Seconded.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is a funny motion. You destroy the one and make another.

DEL. RIORDAN: Then I would move it as an amendment.

DEL. LINGENFELTER: I second it as an amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is an amendment to that Brother's motion? indicating Delegate Duncan.

DEL. RIORDAN: Exactly.

THE CHAIRMAN: There has been an amendment made and seconded that Delegate Veal be permitted to cast the vote for Delegate Spear. Does that cover it?

DEL. RIORDAN: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question?

DEL. LINGENFELTER: Now, Mr. Chairman, we are traveling into a peculiar and a pathetic situation, due to the fact that the majority of the individual delegates here are not here under salary; are not here even with expense money. Many of them are running short. We realized when we left our homes that we did not feel justified in putting a heavy tax upon our members, and as a consequence we are here with no salary and no expense money, many of us. Upon one side we have a set of delegates who have expense money with what I con-

sider a good salary, battling against such a situation. It follows then manifestly that these delegates who have neither expense money nor salary will be frozen out in the end. These dilatory tactics that have been pursued by the opposition have prolonged the convention, due to their express determination, in my opinion, to freeze out these wage slave delegates. Those of us that can stand it are going to remain, and I for one want it understood that if I am frozen out I want some one to vote my sentiments. I want the members of my union to be recorded here. And how can we do it? We can only do it by entrusting our vote and our sentiment with another delegate that can remain here that we know will do it, and I for one do not propose to be frozen out by a lot of men that have it in their power to freeze us out. Shame on the men who acted in the manner that they have. Shame on those men who got up in this convention in the most ridiculous manner and put up the most ridiculous arguments, ridiculous parliamentary points of order and everything else, coming as it does from men whose intelligence we must respect because of the fact that they are representing their organizations. I believed them to be men who understood better, that they had our interests at heart, but I am convinced beyond a shadow of a doubt that they are determined to freeze us out, and we are not going to have it. Only last night the boys came to me and said, "Lingenfelter, we can't stand it any longer; we are getting broke; we can't sleep in box cars and eat hand outs and remain here." Now, Mr. Chairman and fellow delegates, to those men that used those dilatory tactics all last week, I appeal to their sense of honor; I appeal to them as men, if they have got a drop of unionism tingling in their blood, that they will not vote to stop us from turning over a proxy to an honorable man that we know will express our opinion, that we know will express the spirit of the members that we represent. We are not appealing for mercy, but we are appealing for the right to vote for the enslaved wage class which we represent. We are not here asking for sympathy, but we are determined that we will remain to the last, and we can only remain, if we are driven out of this convention, by turning over our vote to some one that will vote it right.

A DELEGATE: I move the previous question. Seconded.

THE CHAIRMAN: The previous question has been moved and seconded. Are you ready for the question? (Question called for.) Call the roll.

DEL. SIMS: What is the previous question? To table the motion?

THE CHAIRMAN: The Secretary will call the roll.

DEL. SMITH: What is the previous question? What are we voting on?

THE CHAIRMAN: The previous question is Brother Riordan's amendment.

DEL. KEOGH: I want to notify this convention that I am going to stay to protect the men that sent me. I want to notify the convention that I am not for the tactics that have been shown here. I have not taken the floor while I have been here but once, and if we are not allowed to defend ourselves and show why all these conditions must exist and show what has been done in the past, then I want to tell you that I am going back to the organization that sent me here, and I will tell them the tactics that have been carried on here, and let them be the judges. I am only an individual sent as their servant, and—

DEL. McMULLEN: What are you going to vote on?

DEL. KEOGH: (Continuing)—and I have no right to give my vote to any one that has not clearly the power to vote.

DEL. TULLAR: I rise to a point of order.

THE CHAIRMAN: State the point of order.

DEL. TULLAR: The previous question has been called for and it is not debatable.

DEL. MAHONEY: I want to be informed so that I can know how to vote.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are discussing the amendment to the motion, the amendment that the brother read over there.

DEL. MAHONEY: Does that embody in the amendment the motion to lay on the table?

THE CHAIRMAN: I do not understand so. Did it, Riordan?

DEL. MAHONEY: There is no motion to lay on the table in that amendment, Brother Riordan?

DEL. RIORDAN: No.

DEL. MAHONEY: All right, then I am satisfied.

THE CHAIRMAN: Call the roll on the previous question.

DEL. McMULLEN: I understand we are voting now to shut off debate.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

DEL. McMULLEN: This is not on the amendment or anything else.

THE CHAIRMAN: No; this is "Shall we take a vote on the amendment now?"

The roll was called and the vote announced as follows:

Total Number of votes cast.....	624
Yes .....	394
No .....	230

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is carried. We will now—

DEL. McMULLEN: Mr. President, Roberts' Rules of Order says that it requires a two-thirds vote to carry this question. Here is Roberts' Rules on it. If that is two-thirds by the figures given here I am perfectly willing to submit.

DEL. TULLAR: We have established no rules as yet. Majority votes have carried all questions up to this time. Hence I suggest that that contention is out of order.

DEL. McMULLEN: I submit that I am offering you the rules, the ordinarily accepted authority which we have been working under heretofore.

DEL. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, this authority has not been accepted.

THE CHAIRMAN: I recognize that our constitution states that unless otherwise provided Roberts' Rules will govern. But at this stage of the game I am going to rule that this vote is in order and will stand. Now the vote will occur—

DEL. McDONALD: Just one question. That is not supposed to rule that you can transfer the vote of one delegate to another?

THE CHAIRMAN: The President is not clear on that.

DEL. VEAL: Mr. Chairman, and delegates of the convention, I am opposed to the giving of proxies—

DEL. McMULLEN: I rise to a point of order.

THE CHAIRMAN: The vote has been called for by a vote of this convention, and there will be nothing more said on this proposition. We will proceed to take the vote on the amendment. Call the roll.

DEL. KLEESE: State it.

DEL. LINGENFELTER: What is the amendment?

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Is this on the motion?

THE CHAIRMAN: No, not the motion; on the amendment. Now, be clear. The motion was that the secretary be instructed to notify each local union by wire whose delegates had left the convention.

Delegate Riordan made an amendment to the motion that Sister Spear's vote be given to Delegate Veal. Now, you are voting on the amendment. Proceed to call the roll.

DEL. LINGENFELTER: Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order.

THE CHAIRMAN: What is your point of order?

DEL. LINGENFELTER: My point of order is this, that the amendment does not conform to the constitution of this industrial body.

THE CHAIRMAN: Your point of order is not well taken at this time.

The vote was taken. Prior to the announcement of the vote—

DEL. LINGENFELTER: By a slip of the tongue I made a mistake. It is manifest that I am in favor of the proposition. I voted no; I ask that the vote be changed to yes. Manifestly I am in favor of the amendment.

DEL. HAVER: Mr. Chairman, may I make a request of the delegates before the vote is counted?

THE CHAIRMAN: The Brother wants to make a request. The delegates will be quiet for a minute.

DEL. HAVER: Mr. Chairman and fellow delegates, my request is this: I only hope, in the next three or four days that the people who have tried out their power of oratory in this convention will not want to do the same in the future, to have it go down on the record. Let us in the next three or four days get down to business and cut out all this rag chewing that we have done in the past.

The vote was then announced as follows:

Total number of votes cast.....	592
Yes .....	104
No .....	488

THE CHAIRMAN: The amendment is lost. The question now occurs on the motion that the Secretary be instructed to notify each local of the withdrawal of its delegate. Proceed to call the roll.

DEL. McMULLEN: And to ask them to send others.

DEL. HANNEMANN: With the consent of the house, I move that the vote stand as the vote on the motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection?

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Does that imply that if the locals whose delegates have withdrawn from the convention should instruct them to return to the convention they will not be accepted as delegates?

DEL. DUNCAN: I did not intend to imply that.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: I just want to know that, to be clear on this proposition, because one or two locals whose delegates withdrew have already instructed other delegates to take their places and one delegate has been sent back to the convention; so that the matter has to be settled right here.

DEL. McMULLEN: Mr. Secretary, didn't I understand that the motion of the brother right there was that you be instructed to wire the locals whose delegates had withdrawn and ask them to send other delegates?

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Suppose they instruct the same delegate that he must return, what then?

DEL. McMULLEN: If they instruct the same delegate and he presents a telegram or written instructions here, it seems to me they have complied with the instructions.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: All right, that is all I want to know.

DEL. RIORDAN: I am not going to raise an objection against the decision of the Chair, but I have been told that there are delegates upon the floor of this convention who expect later to be called back to their respective locals. Now in the event of a letter coming from a local



union to a delegate upon the floor of this convention instructing him to delegate his proxy to any delegate already seated in this convention, would it not be proper to allow that delegate the privilege of making his selection upon the floor of this convention and delegating his proxy to such delegate? If you rule that a wire must be sent before it will be recognized by this body I will raise an objection. On the other hand, if you rule that such a letter will be recognized and the power granted to such delegate, I will not raise an objection.

DEL. McMULLEN: Let us vote on this proposition.

THE CHAIRMAN: A roll call has been asked for. Call the roll.

DEL. TULLAR: A point of order. I would like a ruling on the suggestion of Brother Riordan.

DEL. SCHOMBERG: He didn't ask for a ruling. He asked a question.

DEL. TULLAR: Will a letter from the local union satisfy this convention?

DEL. SCHOMBERG: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: Wait. The Chair would be of the opinion that should a letter come here duly sealed and signed by the officers of a local union, to the effect that their delegate was withdrawn and instructing him to turn his vote over to somebody else, that it should be accepted by the convention. That is, I would not rule that the convention has got to adopt what the Chair thinks, but that is the way the Chair would look upon it, as instructions from the local union. I believe a local union has a right to withdraw a delegate at any time. The delegates are the servants of the local unions, and the unions have a right to withdraw them and the unions have a right to instruct them; and it occurs to me that instructions to a delegate to transfer his vote to somebody else is a power that belongs to them and should be recognized here by this convention.

DEL. SMITH: Then, Mr. Chairman, how would you rule in the event the delegate received a telegram to that effect?

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, a telegram and a communication with the seal on it are different things. I have seen too much done by telegram that has caused too many men too much trouble, and I have so little faith in telegraph companies that I would not vouch for what comes over their wires.

DEL. BROWN: In case of a telegram from a local at a distance the delegate would not be getting an even show with the delegate that belongs in the vicinity of Chicago.

DEL. McMULLEN: Whenever you attempt to put this ruling of yours in force, I give you notice that I will appeal. It is foreign to this question that we are voting on now. I take it that that vote is entirely foreign.

A DELEGATE: Vote.

THE CHAIRMAN: The vote is called for.

DEL. McMULLEN: Whenever you come to make this decision you are going to get an appeal.

DEL. ROGERS: I want to understand what we are voting on.

THE CHAIRMAN: I will state it once more. Brother Duncan moves that the secretary be instructed to notify by wire each local union whose delegate has withdrawn from this convention. Is that right?

DEL. GOLDBERG: And send another.

THE CHAIRMAN: Now we will proceed to take a vote.

DEL. McMULLEN: I have no objection if there is unanimous consent to the adoption of this.

THE CHAIRMAN: If there is no objection upon the part of any

delegate the Chair will rule that it is adopted by unanimous consent. So ordered.

DEL. FOX: Mr. Chairman; the Special Committee on Transportation and Seating of Delegates is ready to report.

The Committee submitted the following report:

**REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON CREDENTIALS OF TRANSPORTATION LOCALS.**

We report that Local No. 17 of Blue Island, Local No. 7 of San Antonio, Local No. 1 of Englewood, and Local No. 12 of Hammond were in good standing last December at the date of the inception of the Hall-McCabe controversy, and entitled to one vote each, according to their numerical strength.

We report that W. J. Pinkerton, J. E. Fitzgerald, John Plummer, Wm. Hickey and W. L. Hall were in good standing at the time of the inception of the Hall-McCabe controversy, as shown by their cards and the recognition of their locals, their department and the general organization.

We recommend that W. J. Pinkerton be seated in this convention as delegate from Local No. 17 of Blue Island with one vote. We recommend that J. E. Fitzgerald be seated in this convention as delegate from Local No. 7 of San Antonio with one vote. We recommend that John Plummer be seated in this convention as delegate from Local No. 12 of Hammond, Ind., with one vote. We recommend that W. L. Hall and Wm. Hickey be seated in this convention as delegates from Local No. 1 of Englewood with one-half vote each.

WM. R. FOX,  
W. R. PARKS,  
C. H. DUNCAN,  
Committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have heard the report of this committee. What is your pleasure?

DEL. DE LEON: I move that this convention concur in the report. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded that this convention concur in the report of the special committee on the question of the Transportation delegates. Are you ready for the question. (Question called for.)

DEL. MAHONEY: I understand that the report is that these delegates be seated, but in case of one local union that has got one vote, that that be split in two and we give them one-half vote apiece.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

DEL. MAHONEY: I am opposed to that portion of the report, and I move or ask for a segregation of that and have action on that part separately, as I cannot vote on that local union and on the other local unions where one delegate is given a full vote and one delegate given one-half. I am opposed to the splitting of one vote between two men for the purpose of putting two men on the floor from one local union. I do not think that looks right, and I ask that the question be divided in that respect.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there a second to that motion?

The motion was seconded.

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been regularly moved and seconded that the report be segregated in so much as to segregate the first part of the report which occurs on Local Union No. 1, where the committee reports or recommends the seating of two delegates and splitting the vote of either individual to one-half. Are you ready for the question?

DEL. PARKS: I ask unanimous consent for the segregation of that part of the report.

No objection heard.

THE CHAIRMAN: If there is no objection by the mover and the seconder of the motion on segregation, the Chair will declare that it will be so ordered by unanimous consent. It is so ordered. You now have the original motion offered by Del. De Leon on the question of accepting the report on three delegates, which would occur on Local Unions Nos. 7, 12 and 17, leaving Local Union No. 1 out of consideration.

DEL. JOHNSON: I rise for a question of information. The question is, if it is not the opinion of the Credentials Committee that the credentials coming from Local 14 comes under the head of protested delegates of the Transportation department and should be included in this report.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair would state that it is the Chair's opinion that when the convention elected this special committee all business pertaining to that one question was placed in the hands of this committee, and it will be the opinion of the Chair that it took from the Credentials Committee any power to act on the question. And at this time I feel that the question before the house is, Shall we seat the three delegates outside of Local Union No. 1, which has been segregated?

Question called for.

DEL. McMULLEN: Mr. President, the question of the brother there was very natural, as if the claim of No. 14 was recognized as one of the Transportation locals it would give him, being the delegate named, one more vote. He is desirous of getting that vote. He thinks that this special committee, handling the matter of voting of these Transportation locals, should handle his at the same time. The Credentials Committee never had that matter under consideration whatever. It has yet up to this time not made its appearance on this floor. This is the first time it came in question here. I have not heard any evidence on it, and while I do not want to delay the consideration of these brothers, now about to receive a vote, I think that the special committee ought to consider the conditions surrounding his case. Now, on the general merits of this report, from my point of view the matter of giving these brothers seats and a vote is clearly a violation of the constitutional law of this organization. I cannot from my point of view vote to give these brothers a voice here or a vote here, and I do not believe that it is necessary in any sense to rehash the reasons why; I have stated them before, and I shall vote no on this question.

DEL. PARKS: Mr. Chairman, I will state that Bro. De Leon's motion does not discharge the committee. If there are any of the railroad locals who are protested in any manner we will be open to them to present their matter before us, or in any contested matter that comes within our province, to take up the case. If it does not, we will so report back to the convention, and the convention can refer it to the Committee on Credentials.

DEL. McMULLEN: If that is the procedure, I shall have to object. There is nothing in the report of this special committee only for those two.

DEL. FOX: I shall object also as to No. 14.

DEL. McCABE: They were in good standing, and they paid their per capita tax right up to date in the Transportation department. Bro. Kohl has been received here as the representative of that department. Local 14 was notified to place a candidate in nomination at

the same time the other vote was called. They nominated their President, F. D. Henion. I think he received 9 votes in that local.

DEL. FOX: Allow me to raise a point of order. It is this, that Local 14 is not under discussion. We have nothing whatever to do with it.

A DELEGATE: That is right.

DEL. FOX: The vote is on these delegates on whom we have reported.

THE CHAIRMAN: The point of order is well taken.

DEL. McCABE: I just wanted to meet the brother's statement.

DEL. LINGENFELTER: I move the previous question. Seconded.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question? (Question called for.) Proceed to call the roll on the seating of the three delegates in question.

The roll was called, resulting as follows:

Total number of votes cast.....	623 $\frac{1}{2}$
Yes .....	383 $\frac{1}{2}$
No .....	246

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is carried, and these delegates will be seated.

DEL. McMULLEN: I offer a motion that the other matters, the segregated part of this committee report, be referred back to the committee and they be requested to decide who shall cast that vote. Seconded.

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded that the question of the delegate from No. 1 be referred back to the special committee. Are you ready for the question? (Question called for.)

DEL. FOX: I will announce that we have another report to make on a credential and will be ready to make it inside of a minute.

THE CHAIRMAN: Will that be acceptable?

DEL. McMULLEN: It will be acceptable to me. I will not delay the convention. I understand this is definite, is it? I understand that there has been handed to the secretary of the committee another credential. We do not feel that we have got the power to accept credentials unless they are offered through the convention. I therefore offer this to the Secretary of the convention: (Handing paper to the Secretary.)

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair is of the opinion that until the Credentials Committee are discharged they are supposed to handle all credentials and report to this convention.

DEL. DE LEON: That certainly is correct. All these credentials must go through the regular channel, and the regular channel is the convention, and the regular channel of the convention is the Secretary.

A DELEGATE: That is right.

DEL. DE LEON: I often have credentials sent to me, and I hand them over to the secretary. I cannot go hunting for the Committee on Credentials.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair is of the opinion that the Credentials Committee should be discharged; there is no use for them.

DEL. KLEESE: You would have to elect a new one, would you not?

DEL. SCHOMBERG: I think so.

DEL. McMULLEN: For that Credentials Committee I would say that we would cheerfully and willingly accept our discharge.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is the committee ready to report?

## ADDITIONAL REPORT ON CREDENTIALS.

DEL. PARKS: If it be allowed, this committee will make a supplementary report, to seat the one of the delegates from Local No. 1 that has been agreed upon as the one who shall cast the vote.

"Supplemental report of the Transportation Department Status Committee, recommends that W. L. Hall be seated as the delegate and William Hickey as the alternate. Signed by the committee."

DEL. DE LEON: I move to concur in the report. Seconded.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, there is a motion; do you withdraw yours?

DEL. McMULLEN: Had you asked me to have that withdrawn I would have done so at your request.

THE CHAIRMAN: You do withdraw your motion, do you?

DEL. McMULLEN: Why, certainly, at your request.

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded that the supplementary report of the special committee be accepted. Are you ready for the question? (Question called for.)

A DELEGATE: There is no objection.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection?

DEL. CRONIN: Mr. Chairman, I do not want a roll call. There is only one or two that wants to be reported voting against it. I am not trying to have a vote, but I want to be recorded as voting against seating the delegate.

DEL. MAHONEY: The delegates from No. 1 are in the same position as the delegates from the others are. I voted no before, and I wish to be registered just the same as on the other. I am willing that my vote shall stand just as it did on the other. I think there is not a delegate on this floor that opposes settling the question that way. I will vote no if they have a roll call. I voted no on the other, and I desire to vote the same way on this.

THE CHAIRMAN: Bro. Mahoney desires to be recorded voting no. Is there anybody else that so desires?

DEL. CRONIN: I do.

DEL. SCHOMBERG: I ask for a roll call.

THE CHAIRMAN: A roll call is asked for.

DEL. FOX: This is a roll call on seating all of them.

A DELEGATE: What is the question?

THE CHAIRMAN: The supplementary report seating this delegate and alternate; acting on W. L. Hall as the representative of No. 1.

The roll was called and the vote announced as follows:

Total number of votes cast.....	614
Yes .....	380
No .....	234

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion has been carried. Bro. Hall is recognized as the duly authorized delegate from Local Union No. 1.

DEL. FITZGERALD: Now, Mr. President, we contesting delegates would like to be informed whether we are now considered representing local unions of the I. W. W., or are we delegates in the supposed Transportation department?

DEL. MOTHERWELL: Local unions.

DEL. FITZGERALD: Local unions? Is that the way?

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair would be of the opinion that you are representing local unions in the Transportation department.

DEL. FITZGERALD: That being the case, if I understand it correctly, the Chairman has stated that we are supposed to be local unions in the Transportation department. We, the Transportation

locals, absolutely refuse, while this department exists, to take a seat in this convention. We are not standing for fakerism; we are not standing for it.

DEL. SCHOMBERG: I rise to a point of order.

THE CHAIRMAN: State your point of order.

DEL. SCHOMBERG: At the present time this is putting the Transportation department on trial; is it not, or is it? I ask a ruling on Brother Fitzgerald's statement just now; I want a ruling on it.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair would rule that the point of order is well taken; that if the matter is taken up it should be taken up directly under a motion for that purpose.

DEL. DE LEON: I move that we now hear the report of the national officers. Seconded.

DEL. FITZGERALD: If being a delegate here, I would like a ruling. (Delegate Mahoney took the chair.)

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The ruling was that in the opinion of the Chair, to take up the question whether or not there is a Transportation department, it would require a vote. That was my ruling and I at this time recognize the motion of Delegate De Leon as the property of the house. It is regularly moved and supported that we now hear the report of our national officers.

DEL. PARKS: I rise to a point of order.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: State your point of order.

DEL. PARKS: My point of order is this, that Del. De Leon's motion is out of order, because it has been understood, and by unanimous consent, I believe, that we should seat these Transportation delegates, that we should seat the musical representatives, and dispose of the matter of seating the members who have been wanting to get on the floor of this convention, and I think we ought to dispose of that for the sake of harmony and for the sake of expediting the business of this convention. For this reason Delegate De Leon's motion is out of order. I think the next order of business is taking up these reports from the Musical department. I think that is right.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The records so show, don't they, Mr. Secretary?

THE SECRETARY: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The Chair will then rule that the point of order is well taken, and I do not think Del. De Leon will object.

DEL. DE LEON: No, let it go, provided we go under the regular order of business, to something else.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: All right, that is my opinion. The Committee on Credentials will submit their report on the Musical department to the convention.

DEL. FITZGERALD: I want to state to this convention that I refuse, for one, to be seated; that until after we hear the report, we refuse to be seated with fakirs and we will not compromise, and therefore whether we are out of order, or in order, we will not stand for any compromise and sit in competition with labor union fakirs. That is all I want to say.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: I want to say to the delegate that I want you to have the floor; I want you to take up any matters that you have got to take up; but I do hope that delegates will proceed with the regular order of business that they have got outlined. I believe there is a proper time for every delegate to have the floor, and as one delegate on the floor I want to see every delegate get the floor in any question of importance to this organization that he wants to bring up at that time. Is the Credentials Committee ready to report on the Musical department?

## CREDENTIALS OF MUSICAL DEPARTMENT.

DEL. McMULLEN: Where is the chairman of that committee? Mr. President, in the matter of the credentials of this Musical Union, or Musicians' Union, I cannot submit what is deemed right now a special report. I am in doubt whether they are entitled to ten votes or twelve votes, and I cannot decide it until we see the ledger of the organization; I mean the ledger of Brother Trautmann. We did not do that this morning, and I cannot give an authentic statement on it, and that is the reason why I asked the chairman of the committee. That they are entitled certainly to ten votes, there can be no question, and I believe they are entitled to twelve; and if you will bear with us till after dinner, I mean after the noon recess, and permit us to go over and get an official statement from the ledger, then Brother Keogh and I will report. If it is necessary, I will go right now.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: If there is no objection the committee will be given the time required to report.

DEL. COX: Mr. Chairman, I now ask—

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: It is understood, if I remember correctly, and I believe it is so recorded, that Del. Parks withdrew his motion on submitting the report of the Committee on Rules of Order to the house until this case is decided.

DEL. McMULLEN: There are some more credentials here, aren't there, or are there? I know I submitted one, and I understood there was another one there.

ASST. SEC. EDWARDS: The credential filled out was the Musical Union credential. No, I see nothing else here.

DEL. McMULLEN: I beg your pardon. Isn't there a credential there? There is another credential from the delegate from the same division, Mr. Shurtleff. I beg your pardon. I certainly handed that in.

ASST. SEC. EDWARDS: These are the credentials:

"This certifies that at a meeting of Musicians' Local 25, located at New York, held September 21, 1906, the bearer, Daniel De Leon, was elected to represent said organization as a delegate.

(Signed) JAMES COOPER, President.

JAMES BINGHAM, Recording Sec'y."

And here is one sent from the International Musical and Theatrical subdivision of the Public Service Department: "In convention held at Chicago, September 17th, 1906, the bearer, W. Shurtleff, was elected to represent said organization as a delegate to this Convention.

(Signed) P. K. LARSON, President.

W. SHURTLEFF, Recording Secretary."

The other is similar from the same organization, that the bearer, W. Shurtleff, is elected to represent this International, and signed in the same way by the same persons. That is all I see here.

DEL. KLEESE: One is a duplicate of the other, is it not?

ASST. SEC. EDWARDS: Yes. Here is a letter which I presume the secretary intended to read. It relates to the delegate who withdrew, Comrade Gilchrist:

"Dear Sir and Brother: Received telegram from Brothers at convention that Brother Gilchrist left convention. Kindly see that John Desmond takes his place to represent our local No. 215 of the Industrial Workers of the World.

L. A. Jewel, Financial Secretary,  
Pittsburg, Pa."

DEL. McMULLEN: Has it got the seal of the organization on it?

ASST. SEC. EDWARDS: I would presume that it had the seal, but

I think probably in making notes here Sec. Trautmann has torn off the corner.

DEL. McMULLEN: It certainly had the seal on.

ASST. SEC. EDWARDS: There is a part of the seal.

DEL. McMULLEN: Yes, it certainly had one.

ASST. SEC. EDWARDS: Yes, there is a part of the seal visible here, plain and distinct.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Has the Credential Committee any recommendations to submit with those credentials?

DEL. McMULLEN: This communication has never been referred to the Credential Committee. We cannot receive anything unless it comes from this convention to this committee.

DEL. MOSKOVITZ: I move that these credentials be given over to the Credentials Committee. Seconded.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: It has been regularly moved and seconded that the credentials referred to be referred to the Credential Committee. If there is no objection on the part of any delegate, it is the proper procedure, and it will be so ordered. Well, if there is any objection—

DEL. TULLAR: Brother Chairman, now in regard to these delegates here from the Musicians, I don't want to offer a motion, but I would like to make a suggestion. The report of the general secretary-treasurer shows that they have paid \$451.91. Now, taking that as a basis, upon the same plan and by the same course of reasoning—

DEL. MOSKOVITZ: A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: State your point.

DEL. MOSKOVITZ: My point is that the Credential Committee has not yet given any report to this convention, and consequently there is nothing before the house.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The chair will rule that the point is well taken.

DEL. McMULLEN: About these credentials?

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: They are referred to the Committee to make a report on them.

DEL. FISCHER: I move to adjourn till 1:30. Seconded.

DEL. EISENBERG: I wish to make a request before you put this motion. Will you allow me just a minute?

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: If there is no objection upon the part of the mover or seconder of the motion, I will let you make a statement, if that is what it is.

DEL. EISENBERG: Yes. The locals in Cincinnati elected their three delegates in a convention. They are Fox, Dial and myself. The committee has given us four votes, Del. Fox two votes, Del. Dial one, and me one. Now, I desire to leave the convention, for I have no more money to stay here. I want to give my vote as it was given from 269 to Del. Dial. I think that the Committee on Credentials will remember that we did not come from particular locals, that they just assigned me to 269. I am not a shoemaker, but still I am representing the shoemakers. They just assigned us this way. For this reason I think, if there is no objection, that Del. Dial could carry my vote.

DEL. CRONIN: I will state that the Credential Committee would not apportion the vote among the representatives, as they are representing but three locals. They represented four locals?

DEL. EISENBERG: Yes.

DEL. CRONIN: And whoever represents them, in my opinion, as one member of the Credential Committee, if only one of those brothers stayed here who was duly elected, he would be entitled to those four votes, and I believe the convention would not have any objection under



those conditions. It is not a proxy. These three brothers were elected to represent four organizations. One of the brothers says he has to leave to-day, saying he can't stay here any longer. As I said before, I contend that only one of the brothers from the Cincinnati unions should be entitled to those four votes, whoever represents them. I think it is better that way, and I hope the convention will grant the brother the right to cast those votes.

A DELEGATE: Unanimous consent.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: I would suggest to the delegate, if you think proper, to put it in writing and lay it on the desk, and I do not think there will be any objection when it is taken up. It is regularly moved that the convention adjourn until 1:30.

DEL. COX: I asked the floor three times before that motion was made.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: I know that you and Del. Sims had already risen while this other brother had a prior right to the floor, and I don't believe that the ruling applies further than to the delegate who would be speaking on the floor at the time that motion should have been made. Do you take that as correct?

DEL. COX: I will submit.

DEL. M'KINNON: I make a motion to lay the motion to adjourn on the table. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: It has been regularly moved and supported that the motion to adjourn be laid on the table.

DEL. CRONIN: This is not debatable, but I would like to ask if the committee have something to do that they want to do?

DEL. M'KINNON: Yes.

DEL. CRONIN: Now, I suggest that we should have some time in order to cover the work, and if it is the intention of the committee to do that, I submit the motion should be withdrawn.

DEL. M'KINNON: In view of that fact I withdraw my motion to lay the motion on the table.

DEL. SIMS: I will not consent to that, Mr. Chairman. A question of privilege. I will state to the delegates here that I supported the motion to table that adjournment motion, but I will not permit my second to be withdrawn, and while I will not withdraw my second, I will state, if I am permitted to do so, that the motion that just prevailed was that the credential which was passed upon should be referred to the Credential Committee. My position is, and I raise the point, that the credentials pertaining to the Pittsburg local, of which Bro. Gilchrist is a delegate, has been passed upon by the Credentials Committee, and we referred that credential back to the Credentials Committee, and the proxy can be seated by the demand of the local that Del. Gilchrist has been sent from.

DEL. M'MULLEN: The Credential Committee never had it until a few minutes ago.

DEL. SIMS: Del. Gilchrist's credentials?

DEL. M'MULLEN: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The secretary will call the roll on the motion to lay on the table. Will Delegate St. John assist the secretary here in calling the roll?

The secretary began to call the roll.

DEL. SMITH: What are we voting on?

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: There was a motion made that the convention would stand adjourned until 1:30, and a motion was made to lay the motion on the table. You are now voting to lay the adjournment motion on the table.

DEL. SIMS: Mr. Chairman, I don't want to delay the matter, so I withdraw my second.

A DELEGATE: There is no objection.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: If there is no objection now on the part of any delegate the motion can be withdrawn. The vote will occur now on the original motion to adjourn till 1:30.

DEL. M'KINNON: Make it unanimous.

Adjourned until 1:30 p. m., September 25

#### AFTERNOON SESSION—SEPTEMBER 25

The convention was called to order at 1:30 p. m. by President Sherman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any other committees to report?

DEL. PARKS: Mr. President, I believe that the matter of seating delegates has been disposed of, has it not?

THE CHAIRMAN: I believe so, unless—

DEL. PARKS: I will ask if the Committee on Credentials have a further report.

THE CHAIRMAN: Have the Committee on Credentials got any further report at this time?

DEL. M'MULLEN: We have nothing that is ready to submit to the convention here, only the matter of Bro. Gilchrist, of No. 215. There are credentials that the union sent here asking that John Desmond of the same local be given his vote; and also the Credentials Committee had the matter of him representing Local Union 302. The committee decided that he should have a vote from each. That would give him two votes.

In the matter of Samuel J. French, representing Locals 150, 314, 393, the original mistake in the matter was that the credentials did not name another party who had been accredited. His name was on, but he could not explain what it was. The committee recommend that he be allowed a vote for each one, 150, 314 and 393, making three votes for him, one for each. I do not know how many he has. The matter is under the consideration of those three locals.

In the matter of John M. Francis, from the Coal Miners of Illinois, he is a member, as I understand it, of the union at large. He simply desires to come before this convention and explain from his standpoint the wants of the coal miners of Illinois. The committee recommends that the convention allow him that time whenever they may see fit.

In the matter of the standing of Local 25 of the Metal and Machinery Workers, or rather the Metal and Machinery department, the committee's views are that they are represented by the delegate of that department, and that it is one of those matters that the committee had no action to take upon or recommend.

In the matter of Shurtleff's credentials from the subdivision of the Department of Public Service, the committee considers that that matter is before the convention to determine. The local, so far as we know as a committee, have been provided with representation. Now, we think that is a matter for the convention to decide, whether he shall or shall not represent the so-called sub-division. We have no recommendation on that matter to make.

It was moved to concur in the report. Motion seconded.

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded that we concur in the report of your Credentials Committee. Are you ready for the question? (Question called for.) Will this be passed by unanimous consent?

A DELEGATE: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection to passing this by unanimous consent? If not, it will be so ordered.

DEL. M'MULLEN: You should send this matter to the Musical unions.

DEL. CRONIN: Mr. Chairman and Delegates, we find upon the books of the General Secretary-Treasurer that this musical organization as a whole has paid to the general office of the Industrial Workers of the World the sum of \$451.91, and approximately, if you take the six-months' basis that this organization has been paying, it would be paying on about 800 members, which would entitle the delegate who has been seated in this convention to 16 votes.

DEL. FOX: Mr. Chairman, do I understand that that is what they paid in for the whole department?

DEL. CRONIN: Yes.

DEL. FOX: I understood that these delegates only represented four locals.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: That is for the whole year, is it not?

DEL. CRONIN: That is for beginning Oct. 24, 1905, to July 1, 1906.

DEL. FOX: But I understand these delegates only represent four locals, and not the whole department.

DEL. CRONIN: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair would like to have some information. Was there not a credential read here this morning for Shurtleff, who represents something, whether the department or local, the Chair is not clear?

DEL. CRONIN: Department.

THE CHAIRMAN: Department, that is what I thought. The full department would be supposed to be divided among the delegates that are to be seated.

DEL. FOX: I would like to know, then, how he was elected. Was he elected by a regular vote in that department?

THE CHAIRMAN: I cannot answer that.

DEL. FOX: The reason I ask—

DEL. CRONIN: I can explain to the brother that Shurtleff was elected at a sub-division meeting of the members of the Musical or organization local. He was elected here in Chicago I think at the time the convention started, last Sunday. I do not know whether they completed their work or not, but Shurtleff was elected by the delegates of that so-called sub-division.

DEL. FOX: That is what I was coming to. I went down to attend that meeting myself, or I held a sort of proxy; I did not need to go down there; it was sent to me by the union in Cincinnati, and we could not get that convention. I understand that they really had no convention at all to amount to anything; that it was only a gathering of two or three members.

DEL. AUGUSTINE: A point of information. I would like to know whether they have members in good standing within the provision of the law, on the roll from Feb. 1 to July 31.

DEL. CRONIN: I will state that the amount of money paid into the general treasury of this organization does not show that they have had. The amount of money paid into the general treasury between the months of Feb. 1 and July 31 would be upon a basis of 492 members. Now, Mr. Chairman, the reason I bring this matter before you is this peculiar condition: that the motion that has been passed by this assembly or convention was to the effect that the

delegates be seated and that they have a vote upon the money they have paid into the general organization at the rate of 8 1-3 cents per member per month. I understand now you raise the constitutional contention that it should be between the months of February and August?

DEL. RICHTER: It would be from October. Didn't they start to pay in October?

DEL. CRONIN: Oct. 24, 1905.

DEL. RICHTER: Well, didn't it start from there?

DEL. CRONIN: That is when it started.

DEL. RICHTER: It would be nine months.

DEL. HAVER: I would like to ask the delegate if you figured on the basis of 8 1-3 cents per member?

DEL. CRONIN: Eight and one-third cents is the basis for the figures.

DEL. HAVER: I wish to add that if this organization is not a department, but is merely a local union directly chartered by the general office, it would be at the rate of 25 cents per member and the committee can so figure.

DEL. CRONIN: Mr. Chairman, if I may be allowed to reply to the delegate, I will say that according to the motion which has been passed the Credential Committee was instructed to find out the amount paid to the General Secretary-Treasurer, and then we should cover that on the basis of 8 1-3 cents per member per month, and that has been passed on by this convention.

DEL. DE LEON: I rise to make a motion so that we may come to an end and not get entangled asking questions and answering them. My motion is that this matter be referred back to the Committee on Credentials with instructions to ascertain the number of votes that the delegates of those three unions that were seated here yesterday are entitled to. A motion was passed that those delegates be given the vote that they are entitled to. That was the motion passed by this convention yesterday. We find that there is doubt as to how to handle that. The Committee on Credentials seems to be at sea on the matter. My motion is intended to give them directions. My motion, therefore, is that this matter be referred back to them with instructions to ascertain the number of votes that the delegates of these three unions which were seated—and none of them was seated—to ascertain the number of votes that the delegates of these three unions are entitled to. And if this motion is seconded I shall explain it.

Motion seconded.

DEL. DE LEON: Now, Mr. Chairman,—

DEL. CRONIN: The committee have no objection to telling you exactly what they paid and what they would be entitled to. According to your motion, Bro. De Leon, you do not want to recognize the motion that has been passed on the 8 1-3 cent basis. If you withdraw your motion the Credentials Committee will give you the basis according to the constitution and the vote they are entitled to, and I think it will do away with any squabbling on the floor.

DEL. DE LEON: Well.

DEL. CRONIN: If you want the constitutional basis of 8 1-3 cents the men are only entitled to ten votes according to the money paid. Do you want that?

DEL. DE LEON: Yes.

DEL. CRONIN: The committee will give you that and you can withdraw your motion, and I think it will be accepted unanimously

by the members here and the men will be given that vote. But the committee was instructed to find out how much they had paid; that was the motion.

DEL. DE LEON: I think that argument is perfectly germane when the motion is before the house.

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded that this matter be referred to the committee, and that the committee bring in a further report as to the real standing of these unions.

DEL. DE LEON: No, no; that they bring in a report as to the number of votes that the delegates from the three locals which were seated here are entitled to. That is clear.

DEL. CRONIN: On what basis?

DEL. DE LEON: On the only basis that that may be calculated; naturally on the basis of the per capita paid by the membership of those locals.

DEL. CRONIN: That is, 25 cents a month?

DEL. DE LEON: Whatever it be, under the constitution. I come here, for instance, from a local; you find out how much my local paid.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have heard the motion and it has been duly seconded. Are you ready for the question? (Question called for.)

DEL. CRONIN: I make the point of order that this motion cannot be entertained without we reconsider the prior instruction, which was on the basis of 8 1-3 cents per member per month, which the Secretary-Treasurer, acting as the agent for the I. W. W., had received from them. I make the point of order, understand, that it is in direct conflict with those instructions and cannot be entertained until we reconsider that motion. I would like a ruling.

THE CHAIRMAN: Before I would make a ruling I would like to have that motion that was passed read by our Secretary, that the Chair may be clear on this.

DEL. DE LEON: Mr. Chairman, perhaps we can straighten this matter. The statement did not seem to be clear; perhaps I did not hear it correctly. I am told by the chairman of the committee that it was a concrete proposition of ten—

DEL. RICHTER: We have carried that.

DEL. DE LEON: If we have carried that and that is a complete recommendation, I ask leave to withdraw my motion, and I would then substitute it by a motion to concur.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does the second permit?

A DELEGATE: I agree to withdraw.

DEL. CRONIN: If you consider it that way, 25 cents a member for the 492 members—

DEL. DE LEON: I withdraw objection.

DEL. CRONIN: I want to make an explanation so you will clearly understand. They pay on 492 members now. On the basis of 25 cents that would give us 492 members, or 500 in round numbers, which is equivalent to ten votes any way you put it.

DEL. DE LEON: I move that we concur and that the delegate have ten votes. Seconded.

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been regularly moved and seconded that we concur in the report of the Credential Committee on the question of the Musical union.

DEL. CRONIN: I want to know what you concur in. Is it on the basis of six months, under the constitution?

DEL. LINGENFELTER: Yes.

DEL. CRONIN: That it is on the basis that you have a constitution. I considered that we didn't have any for several days.

DEL. RYAN: I would like to ask at this time if action on this matter, if it is in favor of it, will recognize this Musical union as a part of the Public Service Department.

DEL. FOX: It will not, any more than the others in the Department of Transportation.

DEL. RYAN: I will ask of the Chair, does that imply recognition of the Musical union as a part of the Public Service Department?

THE CHAIRMAN: I will say that the Chair is not clear yet on what basis they are figuring, whether it is a musical union or a department.

DEL. RYAN: That is the point I want to get at. I want to know if those delegates are seated here as representatives of a department or if they are seated on the basis of 8 1-3 cents per month per member. If they are seated merely as members of local unions, then I believe it should be upon the monthly payment of 25 cents per member. I would like to be clear on this matter, if you have no objection, before I can vote intelligently.

THE CHAIRMAN: My understanding is that they are seated on the basis of ten votes, and they have accepted that report of ten votes. Now, will you explain what that ten votes means?

DEL. CRONIN: The ten votes means that the Secretary of this organization has accepted a certain amount of money from this organization, but did not know how to credit it to them, whether as a department, a sub-division or a local organization, and in order to give the members representation in this convention a motion was made, which was passed, that they be given representation according to the amount of money—neither as a department, neither as a local, neither as a sub-division; they are seated according to the amount of money that they had paid to the General Secretary-Treasurer at the rate of 8 1-3 cents per member per month. So they are getting no representation as a department, as a sub-division or as a local organization. That is to be determined by this convention, later, as I understand.

DEL. RYAN: That is the point I want to bring out. I wish to be clear on this matter so that I can vote intelligently, as I stated before.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you understand it now, Bro. Ryan?

DEL. RYAN: Yes, I understand it to a certain extent, but the matter is still confused, and I insist upon that point for the simple reason that I cannot, as far as I am individually concerned, make up my own mind whether they are seated as delegates representing a local union of the Industrial Workers of the World, as delegates representing a department or as delegates representing a sub-division of that department. I understand that there has been something in the nature of arbitrary action taken in this matter. Now, Del. Cronin has stated here, upon the basis of representation as involved in the present motion under consideration, that they are neither specifically members of local unions, members of a sub-division, nor members of a department. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that the matter has not been made clear by the report of any members of the Credentials Committee as to how we should seat them. I understand that the matter is not just clear as to how they are being seated here.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair is not clear, himself, and he would like to be clear on this before he feels that they can vote intelligently on it.

DEL. MCKINNON: A point of order. The committee have made their report, and they are giving you the facts in the case. Now, I think it is up to this convention to seat those delegates as you may see fit. I think that is the only way out of it. Nobody seems to be

clear. I am not clear, and I think that the only proper way is to have this convention take action right here and now.

DEL. RYAN: That is my idea.

DEL. McKINNON: The committee have told you all they have done, and that is all they can do.

DEL. HAVER: A point of information. I would like to make a motion to cover this matter; either to seat them as a department, a sub-division or a local union.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is before the house, and it can be amended. There is a motion before the house that can be amended.

DEL. HAVER: Do you say an amendment would be in order?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

DEL. HAVER: Then I would make an amendment that we seat them as a department. Seconded.

THE CHAIRMAN: There is a motion to amend, that they be seated as a department. Are you ready for the question? Delegate Mahoney, will you take the chair?

(Delegate Mahoney took the chair.)

PRESIDENT SHERMAN: I would like the floor on that amendment.

DEL. HAVER: I believe I can clear this up.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem.: The delegate has the floor.

(The Chairman pro tem. requested delegates speaking to announce their names in order to assist the stenographer in his work.)

DEL. COX: I claim that it needs no motion at this time to seat the delegates. They were seated yesterday. The motion made yesterday to seat them embodied this proposition, the deciding whether they were a department, a sub-division of a department or not, to be taken up later, and the Committee on Credentials was instructed to find out the number of votes that they were entitled to according to the amount of money paid into the national organization at the rate of 8 1-3 cents per member per month. The committee brings in that report, they were seated, and it needs no motion to seat them. They were seated yesterday.

DEL. SIMS: Mr. Chairman—

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem.: Del. Sherman has got the floor. You will have the floor next, Del. Sims.

PRESIDENT SHERMAN: I am opposed to that amendment as to seating them as a department. They have never been recognized as a department by your Secretary. They have never been recognized either as a department or a part of a department by the Executive Board. They have never been treated as a department or any segment of a department only in so much as your General Secretary has permitted them to pay their tax at the same rate that a department does. If you recognize and seat these delegates with the understanding that they are seated representing the Department of Public Service, they have a right to demand upon the general administration, whoever it may be, after the adjournment of this convention, to turn over to them all local unions that now hold charters directly from the general administration, that would come under the Public Service to their department. I do not believe that there is any excuse for recognizing them as a department, and I think at this time a great mistake would be made if you did recognize them as a department. I am of the belief, however, that had they come in here regularly last year, they would probably have been installed. But they did not. And it means this for your general office; if you turn over to the department as named in this amendment all local unions that would come under

the head of Public Service, you would shut off a great income to the headquarters, and I do not believe that there are unions enough established in the proper sections of the country as yet, I do not believe the membership is large enough in the various local unions, including also what might be in this Musical Department, to warrant the Industrial Workers of the World at this time in launching a Department of Public Service. That is my principal reason, and my only reason, for opposing the amendment.

DEL. PARKS: I rise to a point of order.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem.: Del. Sims has got the floor.

DEL. SIMS: In view of the statement of the president of the department proposition, while the Transportation Department was insisted upon by him to be seated as a department, in the event of the Musicians not being seated as a department, I wish to offer as a substitute for the whole that the present locals be seated as locals according to the per capita tax that they have paid into the general organization as locals and not as a department.

A DELEGATE: How are you going to find out?

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem.: Do I hear a second?

The substitute was seconded.

DEL. PARKS: I rise to a point of order.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem.: State your point of order.

DEL. PARKS: A while ago I rose to raise a point of order and I stated that I rose to a point of order, and you recognized Del. Sims and he made a motion. I maintain that that point of order takes precedence, and therefore what he has done is out of order.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem.: If you were rising to a point of order. Is that right?

DEL. PARKS: I was rising. Therefore I hold that the motion made is out of order now. Will you overrule what he has done? If you do, the point of order that I was going to raise now will not be raised, which I intended to raise a while ago. I want a ruling.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem.: Before giving a ruling on the point of order I want to make my position clear to the delegates. It would appear to me at this time that the motion and the amendment and the substitute are all out of order since you rescind your former action.

DEL. PARKS: Exactly.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem.: It would appear to me that through the instructions of this convention by a motion in your records yesterday, that the report that you sought to act on at this time was not a report on seating the delegates as locals or as a department, but was to designate the vote in accordance with the amount of money that they paid.

DEL. PARKS: That is my point of order.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem.: And I am of the opinion that the entire matter before you at this time in the form of motion, amendment and substitute is out of order and should be ruled out of order.

DEL. PARKS: Not the motion.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem.: And that is the ruling of the Chair at this time, that none of the motions before the house are in order.

DEL. RICHTER: It is a motion to concur.

DEL. DE LEON: Do I understand the Chair to rule that my motion to concur with the recommendation is out of order? That is the motion.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem.: Was that all embodied in the motion?

DEL. DE LEON: It was all embodied.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem.: Then Del. De Leon's motion is not out



of order, but the amendment and the substitute are out of order, and I so rule.

DEL. PARKS: I wish to state that that was the point that I rose to a minute before Sims took the floor.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem.: You are satisfied?

DEL. PARKS: I am satisfied.

Question called for.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem.: Now then, the understanding the Chair has got of the motion is that those delegates who were seated be accredited ten votes. Is that right?

DEL. RICHTER: Yes.

DEL. DE LEON: As a recommendation.

A DELEGATE: No objection.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem.: You have heard the motion. Are you ready for the question? Question called for.

DEL. RYAN: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask again the specific information from the Chair: Should this motion carry at this time, should it prevail, what position does that delegate in the convention occupy as to the standing of the Musicians—as a department or as locals? It merely gives them a seat without recognition as to their department form?

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem.: The Chair would rule that if my understanding of the consensus of opinion of the members is correct, that you are not recognizing them either as a local union or as a department. I believe that is the only way that the convention can seat them at this time, as they have never been recognized as either one, and that this will have no bearing as to the standard of their connection with this organization, either as local unions or recognition as a department. If that is thoroughly understood, is that satisfactory to you, Bro. Ryan?

DEL. RYAN: Yes.

Question called for.

DEL. TULLAR: Unanimous vote.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem.: A unanimous vote has been called for. If there is no delegate on the floor that objects to being recorded as voting in favor of this motion, it will be so carried. It is so ordered.

#### REPORTS OF NATIONAL OFFICERS.

DEL. DE LEON: I move you that we now proceed to hear the reports of our national officers. Seconded.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem.: It is regularly moved and supported that we do now proceed to hear the reports of our national officers. You have heard the motion. Are you ready for the question? (Question called for.)

DEL. CRONIN: Has the Committee on Rules reported?

DEL. KLEES: They have not, but they are ready.

DEL. CRONIN: I would like to know if we cannot have first the report of the Committee on Rules and then go on down the line of reports of officers.

DEL. DE LEON: I would request the Committee on Rules to postpone reporting for the reason that after the national officers shall have reported there will be no debate; the reports of the national officers will have to go back to the Committee on Constitution, and there will be no opportunity from now on until the national officers shall have reported for anything that the Committee on Rules proposes to put into effect. If we allow the Committee on Rules to report now we simply open the doors again to a debate which is possible, and we postpone another

day the reports of our national officers. If we now take up the reports of the national officers, and should that take the rest of the evening the Committee on Constitution will have so much more to work upon, and the Committee on Rules can make its report afterwards, and nothing is lost.

DEL. McDONALD: We should have the report of the Committee on Rules. How can we do our work if we don't have rules? That is the stand I take. If you are going to have the reports of the national officers without making rules, what disposition are you going to make of the reports, as I understand from Brother De Leon that we are to carry on the work of the convention according to rules?

DEL. PARKS: Mr. Chairman: Mr. Chairman, I rise to support Bro. De Leon's motion. Why? The Committee on Rules and Order of Business will not fully know what different questions there are to be taken up. No doubt the Chairman and the Secretary-Treasurer will mention several matters which will need the attention of the different committees and which the Committee on Rules and Order of Business might never think necessary to include in their original report. This is regular. It is taken up in all legislative bodies in this way. Our national Congress opens up with the President's message before there is any organization work that goes on in either house. It is the natural way, it is the logical way for it to be taken up, and I hope the question may be passed on speedily and we will hear the reports of our general officers as provided for in our national constitution.

(Question called for.)

DEL. KINNEALLY: I move the previous question. Seconded.

DEL. HAYER: I call for a unanimous vote.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem.: The previous question has been called for. If there is no delegate on the floor who objects to being recorded so, it will be declared carried.

DEL. CRONIN: I rise to ask if the motion on the previous question is debatable at all?

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem.: No.

DEL. CRONIN: It is not debatable. I don't want to take up the time without unanimous consent, but the tactics are by the same man that gets up and moves for the previous question to shut off debate, but I support a motion at this time to permit further debate.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem.: If there is no further objection the question is carried. The vote now occurs on Delegate De Leon's motion that we hear the reports of our national officers. The secretary will proceed to call the roll.

DELEGATES: No objections.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem.: Do you call for another unanimous vote?

DELEGATES: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem.: If there is no delegate on the floor who objects to being recorded as in favor of this motion, it will be declared carried unanimously. Hearing none, it is so ordered.

#### COMMUNICATIONS.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem.: The secretary informs me that he has in his possession at this time some telegrams that he thinks should be read to the convention. Are there any objections?

No objections being heard, the secretary read the following communications:

"New York, Sept. 26, 1906.

"Convention Industrial Workers of the World, Brand's Hall.

"Greetings from conference of Hebrew Socialist Federation. May success crown your deliberations. Long live revolutionary unionism. Long live working class unity.

"A. Frederick, Secretary."

"New York, Sept. 23, 1906.

"Convention of Industrial Workers of the World, Brand's Hall.

"The Arbeiter Jewish Organ of Industrial Workers wishes you success in organizing working class for overthrow of wage slavery.

"Joseph Schlossberg."

"Ada County Jail,

"Boise, Idaho, Sept. 17, 1906.

"To the Officers and Delegates of the Second Annual Convention of the Industrial Workers of the World.

"Comrades and Fellow Workers:—

"While you have been in convention today I have devoted the hours to a careful review of the proceedings of the initial convention of the I. W. W. and of the conference that issued the Manifesto leading up to the formation of the organization, which has inspired and rekindled the smouldering fire of ambition and hope in the breasts of the working class of this continent.

"With ever-increasing volume the workers throughout the country are resounding the paean of economic freedom, which rang out so clear in the Manifesto. It is a document that should be perpetuated by reading it at each recurring convention of the Industrial Workers of the World. With its salient truth as a corner stone, with our Preamble as a guiding star, no matter which way we go, which way we build, every effort will strengthen and augment the battlements and forces of the working class.

"What magnificent results have been accomplished in a brief fifteen months. The organization has been on a continuous march onward and upward; there has never been a retreat or a backward step. Throughout the West there has been a number of strikes of a more or less serious nature, but in every instance a victory has been recorded for the Industrial Workers of the World. The Department of Mining Industry, the Western Federation of Miners, was never in more flourishing condition; the membership is rapidly increasing; but better than aught else is the fact that we are coming to a closer, keener realization of the ultimate purpose of the I. W. W., and while we may not be as scientific in our deductions or as methodical and tactful in our endeavors, still in our rough and tumble way we will manage to keep in the van of organized labor. And when the day of emancipation comes, the miners will be at the post to furnish material for the Workers of the World.

"We are beginning to recognize our importance as the primary element in the development of civilization. From the raw material that we produce, the coal, iron, lead, copper, zinc, cobalt and tin, are made and perfected the tools and instruments of the artisan and scientist. The miner has been the stepping stone of human achievement from the age of the stone implement, the plow of a crooked stick, the breech clout garb, to the inventions and innovations of modern society. We have depleted the store house of mother earth at a frightful cost to ourselves. The hazardous nature of our occupation under the system of capitalism is more merciless than the carnage of war. We demand a complete and proper recognition of our service to society, a full equivalent for the product of our toil. This we can secure not only to ourselves but the entire working class by an industrial government. To quote from my letter to the Fourteenth Annual Convention of the Western Federation of Miners, 'Organized industrially, united politically, labor will assume grace and dignity, horny hands and busy brain will be the badge of distinction and honor, all humanity will be free from bondage, a fraternal brotherhood imbued with the spirit of independence and freedom, tempered with the sentiments of justice and love of order; such will be the co-operative commonwealth, the goal, the aspiration of the Industrial Workers of the World.'

"This is the spirit and the letter of the Manifesto and the Preamble, the corner stone and guiding star. There can be no more splendid incentive for energetic work. The first year's accomplishment is grand. But we can do better. Let us redouble our efforts. Every man, every woman can help to organize the working class for industrial liberty. May I suggest that it would be a good plan to elect at this Convention a Committee on Constitution composed

of one from each department to frame provisions and such suggestions as the requirements of the organization are sure to develop during the ensuing year? Experience teaches us that changes and amendments initiated in convention without previous careful deliberation are not always good. A general discussion of necessary rules would enable such a committee to submit a report of stability and permanent advantage.

"I have written more than I intended; my purpose in writing at all at this time was not to make suggestions, but to extend to the officers, to the delegates and through them to their respective unions our profound thanks for the splendid support tendered us in our hour of tribulation.

'Stone walls do not a prison make,  
Nor iron bars a cage.'

Our hearts are with you. A little temporary confinement can neither break our health or spirit. Justice must prevail and we will be with you in the Third Annual Convention of the I. W. W.

"I am yours for the right to work for ourselves, when and where we please.  
Wm. D. Haywood."

The reading of the telegrams and letter was received with applause. DEL. SCHWEINBURG: I move you, Mr. Chairman, that this inspiring document by William D. Haywood be sent to all working class papers throughout the country for publication.

Motion seconded and carried unanimously.

DEL. GOLDBERG: I move to call for three cheers for Bro. Haywood.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: And the others.

DEL. AUGUSTINE: I move that we give three cheers for the prisoners in the Ada County jail.

The motion was seconded and unanimously carried and the three cheers were given.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem.: The President will proceed to read his report.

#### PRESIDENT'S REPORT.

PRESIDENT SHERMAN: I desire at this time to say that it was my intention to submit, at the time of reading my report, some amendments for the constitution. But I failed to include them when rolling them up, so I would like to reserve the right to read them in the morning. It won't require but a few minutes.

President Sherman then read his report, as follows:

Ladies, Gentlemen and Delegates:

I appreciate the honor conferred by the position I occupy, because it affords me great satisfaction in welcoming you as delegates to the second annual convention of the Industrial Workers of the World, an organization founded on broad principles, so that all who toil may secure membership, if they so desire, an organization called into existence by continually vindicating its necessity in the history of class struggle between master and slave.

The organization was launched upon the troubled seas of labor in a period when that small portion of labor which claimed to be organized was almost in a chaotic state, owing to the dissatisfaction that had taken a firm hold of the minds of its members. The excuse for this dissatisfaction varies in the different minds of the working class. Some believe that trades-unionism fails to protect the workers' interests, because of the disloyalty of its members, while others believe it is through mismanagement by their officers.

I feel that I strike the keynote when I assert that the system of society is wholly responsible, and not the individual; but I am of the belief that the Industrial Workers can give relief to the workers under the present system, although I

know that the time must come when we must have a complete abolition of the competitive system, and the present form must give way to the co-operative commonwealth. I realize too keenly that this is foreign to the minds of the majority of the workers, which is convincing that the workers must be schooled as to what their future can be if once they unite their economic power into one industrial organization and educate themselves that their weapon must be the "general strike."

At the adjournment of our first convention, which was held in June and July of last year, many delegates to that convention, as well as your president, believed that the new organization, the I. W. W., would start out with a larger membership than it really did.

When it came to the issuing of charters to the unions of the American Labor Union and to the United Metal Workers, it was found that many of the local unions that had previously been connected with the two named organizations failed to go into the new organization, known as the Industrial Workers of the World. This, also, was true of the Transportation Department, which showed a considerable deficiency in membership to what was reported at the convention, as from an approximate estimate on September 1st, 1905, including the Mining Department and other departments, charters had been issued to local unions comprising a total membership of 21,450, which is considerably below the approximate figures that were calculated at the convention.

Taking all things into consideration, I feel that the organization has had a phenomenal growth when I have the pleasure of reporting an approximate membership of dues-paying members, including all departments, of 60,000, which makes an approximate increase of 28,550 members. On September 10th, 1906, we had 394 local unions holding charters. Of this number 120 are not in good standing, being in arrears for tax. I feel that we can congratulate ourselves on the growth of our organization, when taking into consideration that we have been in a continual fight with the master class since the first charter was issued. There has been no time since August, 1905, but what we have had one or more strikes to contend with, which has been more or less responsible for our organization not being in a position to place more organizers in the field than what it has maintained. All of the strikes have been assisted more or less by our organization, and nearly all of them have been assisted by general contributions from our membership and sympathizers, and I desire to extend my hearty appreciation to the general membership and to our sympathizers for the liberal support they have rendered for the maintenance of the many strikes that have been forced upon us in different sections of the country.

Your president has traveled considerable of the district of the United States between Boston and Salt Lake City, in the interest of the organization, where meetings have been held for the purpose of organizing, and I feel safe in making the statement that at this period the sentiment for industrial unionism is much stronger than it was one year ago today. The industrial controversies that have taken place in the trades union movement in the past twelve months have practically been failures, which has much to do with educating the rank and

file to the necessity of uniting their economic power into one industrial organization. Much of the work of organizing new unions has been done by the voluntary service of members who have contributed their time and money for organizing purposes. I have at all times kept as many paid organizers in the field as I felt the organization was justified in doing, with the income at hand.

I desire to thank the many voluntary organizers and friends who have assisted in the building up of the local unions. Our paid organizers are also due great credit for the work they have accomplished. Your president feels that the organizer who devotes the whole of his time to the building up of the organization can never be over-paid, because, if he is honest and earnest in his work, his labors are never at an end. He has no hours nor days of rest, but it is one continual grind of agitation from morning till the late hours of night, and sometimes until the following morning. He is despised, hated, blacklisted and discriminated against by the master class, and many of the workers oftentimes discriminate against their own brothers and sisters who are organizing the workers for the uplifting of humanity. All of this must be borne with patience by the organizer; hence, I feel I am safe in making the statement that there is but a small percentage of men and women fitted to the position of organizer who are able to undergo the physical and mental strain that must be endured in order to carry out the work allotted to them. Hence, I feel that no tribute could be paid that would be too high, or over-drawn, to the organizer of the Industrial Workers of the World.

I regret to report that my attention was called to the fact that an unpleasant feature had arisen in the Transportation Department, which came about through the action of the Executive Board of that department by accepting a supposed resignation from their general secretary-treasurer. The deposed secretary appealed to your president and tried to get him to take up his case. Your president refused to do so, on the grounds that it was a controversy that had arisen between the members of the Executive Board of that Department over constitutional rights of that department, and, as your president or the General Executive Board had not assisted or created that Executive Board or the department's constitution, your president ruled that such unpleasant condition must be settled within the department, as the general constitution of the I. W. W. states plainly that "each department shall control its own financial and industrial affairs." Hence your president felt that he had no right to interfere with department conditions of such nature.

Your president believes that greater care should be used in selecting literature that shall be distributed at mass meetings called for the purpose of educating the workers on industrial unionism. I feel that literature bearing on any complexion of a political nature should be barred from any economic industrial meeting, and that all organizers, or speakers, working under instructions from the Industrial Workers of the World shall enforce such principles. Your president mentions this in his report because he has had the experience. Many times he has found at meetings which he has attended and addressed, men representing political organizations distributing political

literature and, in places, having the same on sale. It is the belief of your president that in many instances this has worked detrimental to the purpose for which such meetings were called, as it makes an impression upon many who attend such meetings who, perhaps, are politically prejudiced, and they go away with the firm belief that the Industrial Workers of the World is a part of some political organization. Your president does not hesitate to say that, in his belief, if the Industrial Workers of the World is not kept clear from all political agitation for the next few years to come, at the very best, it will be impossible to build up an industrial organization of the working class under their present frame of mind. Hence, I feel that the organization should go forward with the work of organizing and that the arguments put forth to the workers must be, to show the difference between trades unionism and industrial unionism.

Your president has but very little faith in the ballot, and looks upon it as merely a paper-wad. At the best, it is only a paper expression, or the reflex of labor. The real weapon that will and must be used by the workers when organized is, the cessation of work. This must be done systematically, momentarily, and to be known as a "general strike." When that strike comes we must be organized and every member educated to the point that when he ceases production for the master he will not surrender the machine, but will take charge of it and convert it to the use and for the benefit of the human family. At this time your president is of the belief that the most forcible argument that will reach the ears of the working class is the argument to show them that through a united movement, such as the Industrial Workers of the World, they can secure better remuneration for services rendered and shorter hours of labor. In other words, it is the bread-and-butter argument that the working class is ready to receive now, and I do not hesitate to state that the arguments of your president since holding his office have been based on these principles, and he will continue to do so whenever speaking of the principles of industrial unionism.

I beg to report that I was in attendance at the convention of the Department of Mining, held in Denver, Colorado, where industrial unionism was discussed in its entirety. The Industrial Workers of the World received the full endorsement of that department, and since the adjournment of that convention great credit is due the members of the Mining Department for the vigorous campaign they have pursued and the agitation put forth for the universal label, the result of which has been felt by the demand for the label through the selling agencies of the West and I feel that the education of our members everywhere cannot be made too thorough on the necessity of pushing and demanding the universal label.

I beg to report that, through instructions received from the General Executive Board, your president and your secretary through an employed attorney, have registered the label of the Industrial Workers of the World in every state with the exception of three.

Your president is of the belief that the greater part of the money expended for paid organizers should be devoted to the Western states for the next six months, for the following

reason: West of the Missouri River the industrial conditions are in a far better state of affairs than they are in the Eastern states, and organizing can be done there without endangering turmoil, in the way of lockouts and strikes. Your president feels that we must get a substantial organization in the West, where conditions are superior to the East, before we will be prepared to make a general campaign in the East, as in the Eastern states the workers in many of the industries are so poorly paid that a strike or lockout means starvation if finance is not forthcoming immediately. Hence, I feel the necessity of first fortifying ourselves with a good Western membership before exposing the organization to a general assault by the employers of the East. Nearly all of the strikes which have taken place during the life of our organization have been in the Eastern states. The workers at those points, being so poorly paid, it has been necessary for them to immediately appeal for benefits, which demonstrates the fact that we must prepare for war before war is declared. Many of our strikes in the East have taken place immediately after the local union was organized, before the members involved in such strikes were hardened and drilled on the principles of industrial unionism, and, in nearly every case, before their local treasury was financially prepared.

However, I am not unmindful of the fact that the East is suffering for the want of organization, much more so than the West, but one local union in the East, when once organized, becomes a greater responsibility to the general organization than three local unions in the West. This is a question which the convention should look at from a business standpoint, as I feel that the life of our organization depends upon the wisdom of organizing the workers, and districts must be considered when dealing on this question.

I beg to report that in the past few months an agitation has been put forth in the City of New York by a few individuals, on the question of one local union for each industry. For instance, those who believe in this policy of organization, namely, that in an industrial center, like New York City, but one charter should be issued to the building trades, and then the trades in that industry be permitted to organize into sub-branches of that one local union, to be known as a sub-branch of the local union holding the charter, the sub-branches not to be chartered nor have any connection with the general administration, except through the one local union holding the charter. This agitation is in violation to the constitution and, to the mind of your president, contrary to the customs which will have to be adopted in order to get the working class to become interested in our movement, and your president does not hesitate to condemn this form of organization, as it centralizes the power of the whole industry into the hands of the members of one local union, and I would recommend that this convention condemn such form of organization and make itself plain on the question of the form of the Industrial Workers of the World, so that no mistakes will be made in the future as to what the constitution really means.

Another matter which I believe is of great importance to this convention pertains to second-class mail matter. There is a bill now pending in Congress to make a postage rate of 4c a



pound for all second-class matter. There is no doubt but that the publishers throughout the country will make a vigorous fight by lobbying against this bill. It is believed by some that a compromise will be made between the supporters of this said bill and those who are opposed to it, to the effect that the said bill will not affect second-class matter such as the Industrial Worker, if the same is issued weekly; but, if the bill goes through as it now reads, or a compromise is made, undoubtedly it will make it impossible for a monthly or semi-monthly publication, such as the Industrial Worker, to enjoy the privileges of the mail, as it would raise the price of the paper to such a figure that the working class could not support it.

I feel that this matter is very important, as our journal, to my mind, is one of the important features of our organization. It might be well for me to say that the above figures submitted would not be sufficient to maintain a weekly journal, and, if this convention should see fit to place the journal on a weekly basis, provisions must be made for its maintenance, and such provisions should be made in accordance with the law that no obstacle will be in the way of getting the same entered in the Post Office as second-class matter. The law reads that, in order that a publication may enjoy the second-class mail privileges, subscriptions must be paid for by the individuals receiving such publication.

It pains me to report that on Saturday evening, February 17th, Brother Chas. H. Moyer, president of the Department of Mining; Brother Wm. D. Haywood, secretary of the Department of Mining, and George A. Pettibone, ex-member of the Western Federation of Miners, were kidnapped by officers of the State of Idaho and, on the same date, at 11:30 o'clock p. m., were forcibly placed on a special train and taken from the State of Colorado and placed in jail in the State of Idaho, charged with murder. This was done without giving the accused brothers an opportunity for a defense or hearing. They were arrested at night and were given no opportunity to notify their families, friends or legal advisers of their condition.

I feel that it is unnecessary to dwell at length on the case, as it has become a national question. I will briefly state that they are at the present time confined to the Boise jail, and up to this date their legal advisers report that they have been refused bail or trial. I feel that this convention should pass suitable resolutions covering this case.

I beg to report that the office of the Industrial Workers of the World has sent out thousands of circular letters bearing on this case, asking for voluntary subscriptions for the defense of the aforesaid brothers. The response has been very liberal, but your president believes that this convention should take such steps as will continue to assist in defraying the expenses for the defense of our brothers in this case. I would recommend that 50 per cent of the per capita tax of the Mining Department be returned to the defense fund until this case is disposed of. I make this recommendation, knowing, as I do, the great expense entailed in such cases. It is conservatively estimated that the case will involve an expenditure of \$250,000 at the least. From what I can learn, not one-half of this amount has been raised as yet. I consider that the supreme

moment and the supreme test are at hand, and this convention cannot afford to desert its friends and brothers in their hour of need. There is a conspiracy on the part of the master class to crush out, if possible, the manhood and the life of those who represent our movement with the hope that by so doing the rank and file will become submissive to the dictation of the money powers. This is the hour to show our revolutionary spirit. We can do nothing but make a legal defense; to do this, it requires finance; it is up to this convention, and I trust it will not be found wanting, but that it will show to the world that we are organized for the purpose of protecting physically, mentally and financially those who are members of our organization.

In conclusion, delegates to the second annual convention of the I. W. W., I welcome you most cordially as workers for the great cause—the binding together of every class of labor in the civilized world.

The work of the organization has been exceptionally tedious. A wide area of the United States has been traversed, while our mail connections have been much greater, the result on which can be termed as a flattering success. Thus far, the strides of the I. W. W. have been gigantic and our work is being felt from ocean to ocean. Wise legislation by this convention will bring to our movement still greater and more miraculous results. Mistakes should be guarded against; the future of our organization is in your hands; the eyes of all the workers of the world are fixed upon this convention. I do not doubt but that you will meet with every expectation and perfect our organization, which will prove a blessing to humanity for all time to come. The labor hosts must be united; the salvation of the human family demands it. The dividing line must be obliterated and under one conquering banner may we march together and strike together, until the producer receives the full fruits of his labor. If the unification of the ranks of labor is opposed by jealous leaders, let them step aside; the one supreme demand is that labor everywhere unite its economic power into one industrial movement. This once accomplished, such an army could at any time take hold of the means of production and distribution and make the world a paradise.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: If there is no objection at this time the secretary may proceed to read his report.

#### SECRETARY-TREASURER'S REPORT.

Sec.-Treas. Trautmann then read his annual report, as follows:  
To the Delegates Assembled in Convention, and the Members of the Industrial Workers of the World:

Fellow Workers and Comrades—Illuminating the darkness of despair that had fallen on the world of labor, implanting new hope and enthusiasm in the life's aim of scores of thousands of downtrodden, did the flashlight emanating from the manifesto issued by industrial unionists in January, 1905, strike equally with piercing, searching and destructive force into the camps of all those powers that are, in open and in secret, organized to trample under their feet all higher aspirations of the working class, to obstruct the road towards emancipation and to combat every inch gained in its onward march by the ever-increasing army of enlightened proletarians.

While millions of exploited and so often betrayed wage earners saw the hopelessness of the daily struggle for a better life and higher civilization, if they were to remain divided on the economic and political field as in the past, while most of them grasped with instinctive zeal-ousness the doctrines expounded by the advocates and pioneers of a new order of things, yet the struggle against the combined powers of capitalism and reactionary plebs leaders made isolated attempts at separation from the old, a task which only the strongest cared to undertake, often with the sacrifice of their personal well-being, and as a target of persecution on the part of those who are conscious of the fact that the gradual disintegration of all institutions protecting the system of today will eventually shatter to pieces the structure itself, while all those removed as former upholders of the existing order are gathering their forces for the construction of a superstructure of a system of society in which the economic organization of the working class will administer the industries of the world for the sole well-being of those who produce by their labor all necessities and good things of life.

The manifesto, an expression finding echo in the hearts of thousands, as pointing out the necessities of our day and giving voice to the aspirations of the wealth producers, proclaimed, in glaring colors, a truth—and on the granite, indestructible rock-bed of truth, of honesty, and a class-consciousness implanted into the hosts of an enlightened proletariat, a structure was to be founded which was to harbor under its protecting roof all those who labored, who have fought and are fighting and striving, who, although often persecuted and victimized, are engaged in the upbuilding of a revolutionary union movement, destined not only to offer and assure immediate relief to millions of exploited within this corporation-controlled society of today, but to train and prepare them, in growing and augmenting strength, for the final historic mission of the working class.

The response to the call embodied in the manifesto brought together, in the first convention, elements with divergent aims. One bent to frustrate the honest efforts of the class-conscious proletarians by attempts of piloting the organization, to be formed, into the waters controlled by the forts of masters and thus making it subservient to the interests of that class; the other determined, and armed with the knowledge derived from an observation of events and therefore fully alive to the duty towards the class from which they came and had acquired their strength, to work for the establishing of an organization which would embody in its entire make-up, its coherent parts, its methods for the attainment of the ends sought for all such features as would forcibly appeal to all those who struggle for the emancipation of the toiling masses from the serfdom of exploitation by a few.

In the inevitable clash between revolutionary and conservative, yea, reactionary forces at the first convention of the Industrial Workers of the World, the former, after many days of hard battling, won out, apparently. With glee and joy they went to announce to the many proletarians who were waiting in intense suspense for the outcome, that years of preparatory work, of seed-sowing and soil-plowing was not wrought in vain, that a foundation for future constructive work had been formed and cemented together, and that the organizing work could be started and continued unabated by elements that were in all their views, their connections and, through their material interests, parts of those powers as are conjointly opposing and thwarting all efforts of the working class for its liberation.

Cheaply bought, indeed, would have been the triumph of those whose sole aim in the labor movement is to see the entire class freed from the bondage of wage slavery, if they had ever sponsored the delusion that the destructive forces of capitalism would abandon the policy of controlling through its agencies an organization which to destroy they knew was well-nigh impossible.

In those days, only few knew of the part played by a few actors behind the scenes, and still more limited is the number of those who conceived that this first act behind the scenes was to be followed by others likewise enacted into the play, so to continue the betrayals, the deceptions, and the blindfolding, under disguise but in the interests of the capitalist class, and lead again to the shambles the thousands of proletarians.

You, who are here assembled here in convention, here to voice the commands of the industrial workers of this land, should expect from all those who have confided in you, that again the flashlight of truth, begetting in its wake confidence and trust, be thrown on all acts and occurrences, whether enacted in the limelight of publicity, or behind the scenes, so that you may be able to direct the destinies of the organization and place it in a position that even errors and mistakes, if occurring, be made the acts of the entirety, which at all times as history has proven, is ready to rectify its own wrong-doings and draw lessons therefrom for the better. You owe this duty to your constituency, to those who are longing to be organized in an industrial organization; in brief, you owe a duty to the entire working class to sift out, without fear or favors, without considering the interests of individuals, the causes from effects, and to suggest such remedies as will place the Industrial Workers of the World before the workers of this land and abroad as being in reality a revolutionary union organization controlled solely by the rank and file of the working class.

To million of wage earners on the American continent, whose spirit has been crushed, whose life energies were paralyzed because of the many betrayals perpetrated against them when in conflicts with the oppressors, to those thousands, and scores of thousands, who had lost confidence in the strength and power of the working class, because they were not aware of the capitalist influences in directing the affairs in the labor movement, to those countless toilers, who were debarred from the capitalist-controlled unions, in all of them the message of industrial unionism touched a chord in their hearts, and they instinctively felt an assurance that they were to become a part of an army militant, truth and light-searching toilers, moved and directed in all actions by the collective intelligence of all. These began to place confidence in the Industrial Workers of the World, and it is the supreme duty of my life and others not to betray that confidence by misleading, distorting reports of the conditions within and without the organization.

Therefore let the truth be known!

#### THE MINING DEPARTMENT OF THE INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD.

Immediately after the close of the first convention, the officers of the Western Federation of Miners reported to the members of that organization the actions of the first convention, and a referendum was issued for the purpose of having the work of the delegates ratified by the rank and file. At the end of August, notice was received, that the members of the Western Federation of Miners had approved, by a big majority, the actions of the delegates in installing that organization

as an integral part of the Industrial Workers of the World, and on September 1st, 1905, the Western Federation of Miners became the Mining Department of the Industrial Workers of the World. The very fact that leading men in that organization were instrumental in launching this organization, and presenting to the workers of this land a programme for action, aroused immediately the forces of reaction, and those who are engaged in protecting the interests of the employing class. The criminal conspiracy enacted in order to crush the active spirit of revolt, as manifested in the organized efforts of the membership of the Mining Department of the Industrial Workers of the World, is too fresh in memory to make it necessary to emphasize the fact, that repetitions of such crimes of the ruling class can only be prevented by a constant campaign of education and thorough organization among the toilers in this land and abroad. While the Mining Department has been the strongest part of the Industrial Workers of the World, and the best supporter so far financially, the membership east and west, south and north of this organization have prepared the ground, and have disseminated the principles of Industrial Unionism among those who are not as yet members of that Department of the Industrial Workers of the World, but should be organized as speedily as possible. The organizers of the Industrial Workers of the World, those who came in touch with the thousands of coal miners in Illinois, Ohio, Pennsylvania, those who have touched the pulse of discontent among the thousands of enslaved coal miners, know that this great mass of wealth producers is ready to cut the navel-string, that holds them attached to the capitalist institutions, and that they, in defiance of the labor lieutenants are prepared to organize in the Industrial Workers of the World. The hundreds of letters received at the office of the Industrial Workers of the World, the requests from the active revolutionary element working in mines of Illinois, in the valleys of Ohio, thousands of those who have realized that they must destroy and break institutions that are keeping the miners in subjection, their voice should be heard at this convention, so that proper steps should be taken to divorce the rank and file, of the coal miners of America from the labor fakir, and make them participants in the struggles of the working-class for the amelioration of existing evils, and for the final emancipation from the thralldom of wage slavery. No boundary lines, east or west, should separate those who wish to organize in the Industrial Workers of the World, and those who were in the field know, that by proper action of this convention, we will accomplish in a short time from now all that the oppressed, the persecuted, the enslaved coal miner was longing for for years; that is, the organizing in a true revolutionary industrial union, controlled by the collective will of an enlightened membership.

#### METAL AND MACHINERY DEPARTMENT.

One of the largest bodies united with the American Labor Union, prior to the convention at which said organization became a component part of the Industrial Workers of the World, was the American and Canadian Council of the Amalgamated Society of Engineers. On account of the somewhat industrial structure of that organization, as different kinds of workers in the metal industry comprised its membership, said society had been suspended a few years ago, from the American Federation of Labor, but by a referendum vote of the members living in the United States and Canada it was decided to become an integ-

ral part of the American Labor Union and support said organization in its efforts to organize the wage earners on more advanced lines.

Isaac Cowen, then delegated to act as officer of that organization on this side of the Atlantic, was one of the promoters of the plan to call the Industrial Union conference in January, 1905, and it was therefore only fair to expect that said organization would become a part of the I. W. W. after its formation, although many of the features in the working program of that society are in direct contrast with the basic rules governing the Industrial Workers of the World. However, the majority of the members in Canada and the United States were known to be in full accord with progressive and revolutionary principles, and the preservation of those members as working and fighting parts of the I. W. W. was considered a plain duty and necessity.

This duty became more paramount when the further facts were considered. On July 14, 1905, shortly before the American Labor Union turned over its remaining property to the I. W. W., the society paid a tax of \$137.63 into the treasury of the A. L. U., and judging from the taxes paid by such Amalgamated Association, within one year the sum of \$2,688.13, it was evident that the membership of that organization on this side of the ocean was honest in the desire to support an organization on progressive lines, although perhaps the full conception of what revolutionary unionism should stand for had not been made known to a full extent to the rank and file.

This mistake of the first convention of the I. W. W. in recognizing in good faith anybody claiming to represent members, although this mistake was unavoidable, was followed by an equally serious mistake in strictly recognizing acts of the convention, as guidance for future deliberations.

The United Metal Workers of America, shortly before the convention a part of the American Federation of Labor, installed itself at the convention through its two delegates, representing, or claiming to represent, 3,000 members, as the Metal and Machinery Department of the I. W. W.

The Metal Workers of the American Labor Union, organized in the Amalgamated Society of Engineers, had no other choice, and the interpretation of the acts of the convention could not be otherwise, than to become a part of the Metal Department, and recognize the administration of said department as the governing body for all those employed and wishing to organize in the industries comprising that department. Because it was unknown to me, and those helping to create order out of chaos, that the United Metal Workers, when installing itself into the I. W. W., had only two executive board members, one of them elected president of the I. W. W., thus leaving one man to handle and administer the affairs of that organization, no endeavors were made to get in direct touch with the accredited officers of the Amalgamated Society of Engineers, until official communications were received relating to a strike of members in Stratford, Canada, and containing inquiries whether the society was still considered a component part of what was known as the A. L. U.

In the correspondence between those interested, suggestions were made purporting to merge the society with the Metal Department on terms to be mutually agreed upon.

The final answer received was, that the former could not remain, or consider itself a part of the I. W. W., and since that time all connections have ceased, although, as a matter of justice, the last general secretary-treasurer of the A. L. U. made the demand that a claim for

strike benefits from members of the society be recommended as legitimate; which was subsequently done.

Four thousand wage earners, who were then members of the Amalgamated Society of Engineers, were thus lost to the Industrial Workers of the World, and it devolved upon those intrusted with the administration of affairs to build up a new organization, and with the assistance of those to whom principles are everything and numbers a secondary consideration to advance to the hundreds of thousands of toilers in the industries comprising the Metal Department the hundred and more reasons why their place was in the militant organization of industrial workers.

In no other industries has the curse of craft division and craft pride worked so much harm and injury as among the workers in these industries. There is no workshop in the United States where the broken courage of one-time aggressive wage earners has not a tale of woe to narrate, and yet there is not a better field upon which the seed of industrial unionism had been planted so profusely for years.

In Schenectady, today the stronghold of the Metal Department, it was primarily due to the indefatigable and untiring efforts and propaganda of a few then denounced and castigated supporters of the S. T. and L. A., believers in the principles upon which said organization had been founded, that thousands are today in the I. W. W.

The communications received from those, who realized that after the days of destructive and missionary work, had to follow a propaganda of construction, form a mile-stone in the ground-work of the Industrial Workers of the World, and without fear of contradiction must it be stated that the preparatory training of the workers in that community by the supporters of the Socialists' Trades and Labor Alliance constitutes a chapter for itself in the history of the American labor movement.

There was no common ground upon which the varying factions of labor's hosts could unite for concerted action prior to the first convention of the Industrial Workers of the World; not a place where they could combine for the struggle against the only foe, and when the Industrial Union manifesto was issued an agency had to be found which would act as intermediary between all those who, aroused by the constant agitation and the pressure of economic slavery, were longing for the moment when they could join hands and embrace the proletarians of all industries in one solidified body.

A body outside the union movement was in this case the medium by which the propaganda was started. It was the Schenectady branch of the "Universal Workmen's Sick and Death Benefit Society," an organization founded on Socialist principles, which, through its members, volunteered to carry on the first propaganda for the constructive work of the Industrial Workers of the World. The support given by that organization to the Industrial Union movement prior to the first convention is recorded by a financial measure, but the amount of work done by them before the first union of metal employees in Schenectady became attached to the Metal Department, will never be measured in its full value and scope. The Industrial Workers of the World membership later took the work out of the sphere of that organization, but the history of this first year of work would not be complete were we to deny credit to those forces, unknown though, who, with the zeal-ousness which only firm convictions in principles implanted, are preparing the great movements which, in their wake, generate the massive

motive powers by which systems of society disappear to give place to others in the onward march to a higher plane of civilization.

Today the members of the Metal Department comprise the most promising and progressive element in the I. W. W., and in the rejoicing over this fact the mistakes made in the beginning may be overlooked, and as the members of that department are fully able to watch the affairs of that part of the I. W. W., and keep it intact as the forceful ramming instrument in the storm against the citadels of capitalism, all who participated in the upbuilding of that department have the assurance that with similar tactics adopted everywhere larger masses of wage earners will come together on "the industrial as well as on the political field," and be fully equipped with the necessary qualifications of being able to take and hold all that labor produces.

#### THE TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT.

From days made memorable by the glorious combat of railway workers under the leadership of a Martin Irons, although they were, apparently only, subdued by the combined powers of capitalist masters and unscrupulous labor lieutenants of that class, on through the period when labor history was made in hours and days by those unflinching militants of the American Railway Union, again to be defeated by the same combined powers, until the epoch when, with renewed vigor, railway workers, organized under the United Brotherhood of Railway Employees, made a capitalist class government of Canada tremble, but again defeated by exactly the same means as had caused all former routs of militant workers, the employees in the railway service, the paramount part of the transportation industry, have time and again demonstrated in America, as well as others in the same branch of industrial activity in other lands have repeatedly shown, that they, when once permeated by a feeling of general class solidarity, when once inspired and moved by a higher ideal, when instinctively linked together by a consideration of the mutual interests of all engaged in the same service, were ready to rise in rebellion when oppression reached a point that further endurance would have meant submission to abject slavery, with the powers of capitalist masters and the state institutions subservient to their command to quell and crush any attempt at resistance.

The many human wrecks and victims bearing testimony to the past heroic self-sacrifices of transportation workers should carry a warning to all true and loyal members of the working class and remind them that the restoration of confidence of all railway and transportation workers in a militant, revolutionary labor organization and its mission is a paramount duty, lest the efforts in other industrial fields be wrought in vain and result again in disaster and despair.

The Transportation Department of the Industrial Workers of the World should embody in all its detail, construction and methods all that was found to be an advantage to the workers in past battles with the capitalist class, and it could reasonably be expected that all such bad features as had spelled defeat, a result of division and the abominable reign of plebs leaders, should have been expunged altogether. No field that looked so devastated as this on which the labor-lieutenants of the capitalist class had worked their desolating game, and despair and sullen resignation seemed to hang like a dark cloud over the millions engaged in that line of industrial activity.

Capitalism may beget its own grave-diggers—so it is said—but the many chief-controlled brotherhoods of railway employees, and other old organizations of transportation workers, offered only the coffins and



graves in which to bury the manliness, the working-class spirit of those scores of thousands whose crippled and mangled bodies are living monuments of a deranged social system with all its horrors for the wealth producers.

Although the transportation workers are eagerly listening to the message of Industrial Unionism,—all those men engaged in railway service, on steamship lines, on wharves, land, shore and sea ostensibly longing to be organized in a compact body, yet the bitter, appalling experiences of the past rendered them pessimistic; too many of the best men have been victimized, brutalized and driven overland, as marked prey to the masters' iron rule, and the labor fakirs' deceitful grin.

The Transportation Department ought to be today the strongest part of the Industrial Workers of the World. It is not! It will not be!

Instituted as a department of the I. W. W., although not having enough members to justify an existence as an autonomous department,—continued as a fraud, with outrageous wrongs perpetrated against the best men in that service, it must continue to be a fraud, at the cost of throwing back into despair thousands of struggling proletarians, unless this convention and the entire membership, as well as those outraged members of the Transportation Department are wide awake to their duties to the working class, and will not fear to brand with eternal ignominy all those responsible for the conditions, and the wrongs heaped mountain high, added to sneer and derision, on those many who in the past have loyally fought with the members of their class and never have proven traitors, and the many more, who in response to the call for united action have, immediately after the first convention of the Industrial Workers of the World rallied around the banner of those who pointed to them the road to their emancipation.

Delegates, so serious, so all-important is this matter that only the radical, uncompromising act of complete purification will destroy every vestige of corruption and graft in that department!

In vain have toilers, working every day with the sweat of their brow, endeavored to obtain justice, nay only a fair investigation; not in vain should they ask for justice from this convention. Either you help to lay a solid foundation for the organizing and educational work among the transportation workers, or you will, by neglecting this paramount duty, remove all justification for the existence of the Industrial Workers of the World.

Let other so-called labor organizations controlled by the capitalist class, cover up the many sins committed against the proletarian class, so that oppressors are able to prolong and continue the game of de-luding and keeping divided and ignorant the workers, but this organization has everything to gain for the wealth producers and absolutely nothing to lose by demonstrating, that by the collective intelligence of the membership it is able to safeguard itself against the invasion of any grafting, corrupting and destructive elements, such as have been a curse on the labor movements of this country in the past.

The United Brotherhood of Railway Employees, a few years ago a militant organization, installed itself as the Transportation Department of the I. W. W., it being accepted as a fact that said Brotherhood was an integral part of the American Labor Union and had at the day of installment 2,087 members.

Represented by as many votes at the I. W. W. convention it could be reasonably expected that the department, to be such, would at least pay tax for as many members as installed, as well as for supplies.

The following statement, containing undisputable figures, will show conclusively what a drag-chain this so-called department proved to be, and how, as facts became known, that department, in order to keep idlers at their jobs, caused a constant drain on the general treasury of the I. W. W.

While the transportation department has paid in taxes to the Industrial Workers of the World the sum of \$130.75, the main organization was constantly paying more into that department, in the vain hope that eventually the workers in that industry would rally around the banner of revolutionary unionism, as unfurled by the Industrial Workers of the World. The general organization paid for an organizer of that department the total sum of \$166.64, transferred three charter application fees, (that is \$30), paid \$145.00 to the president of that organization for organizing expenses among the transportation workers; and, for supplies and stamps furnished to that department, it owed on August 1st the amount of \$289.15, and with other incidental expenses included, not counting in the money paid to the member of the General Executive Board, the total amount of \$640.00, outside of the literature furnished from the general office, and expended on that department. If this convention fails to uproot the evil, if you refuse to give justice to the outraged members of that department, then the Industrial Workers of the World relinquishes the right to call on the transportation workers to organize in this organization, in preference and defiance of the old capitalist-controlled and corrupted brotherhoods; because they will scorn those who point to the indifference, being aware of the fact that the proclamations of purity are mockery and fraud.

It would be an injustice to the membership of the Transportation Department to infer that they depended on others to build up the organization. Only those who observed how those few who installed themselves with the I. W. W. have worked among their fellow men are ready to agree that, were it not for the outrageous acts of a few individuals the transportation workers would today comprise the largest department of the I. W. W.

In defiance of a long train of abuses against those who tried to protect the interests of the rank and file of the Transportation Department, the undersigned was compelled to prefer charges before the Executive Board of the Transportation Department against the main instigator and perpetrator of the many high-handed procedures against members of the I. W. W.

These charges were withdrawn, at the solicitation of the Executive Board members of the I. W. W., and upon the agreement that the unions connected with the Transportation Department be requested to vote on a referendum to disband the department, to become attached to the general organization until such time as a reorganization in a department could take place.

The referendum vote was never called, or at least the General Secretary Treasurer never received notice to that effect. It should now be the duty of this convention to demand an explanation why all efforts to give the rank and file a chance to voice their opinions on the matter were frustrated and even laughed at; because the most active protestants happened to the best advocates of Industrial Unionism.

#### THE INTERNATIONAL MUSICAL UNION.

Actuated by a desire to treat equally fair all those who claimed to represent a number of organized workers at the first convention, no further investigation was made when Wade Shurtleff, who was a dele-

gate representing the American Labor Union, and one of its component parts, the International Musical Union, assumed the same rights as granted to an equally fictitious department, and claimed the title of "International Musical and Theatrical Union, Subdivision of the Public Service Department of the Industrial Workers of the World," on the grounds, considered partly justified, that organizations comprising 1,000, and even less, members, were allowed autonomous department administration and department executive boards; and so that organization has since been using the prestige of the I. W. W. to justify its existence as a part of a department not at all organized.

The error was discovered too late; with an allged constitution that is everything but a true expression of Industrial Unionism, and the fundamental principles thereof, only tax on the basis of department ratio could be exacted, because the actual dues paid by members of that organization amount to 50 cents only every quarter of a year; one of the unions being incorporated under the state laws of New Jersey, state conventions and an apparent alignment according to state boundary lines being another objectionable feature of that organization, and the recent publication of a journal supposed to represent the Public Service Department (I. M. and T. U.), is another illustration of the utter disregard of the basic principles governing the affairs of the Industrial Workers of the World by that organization.

The G. E. B. of the I. W. W. refused to recognize the International Musical Union under the title assumed; but there was no way of reaching the various locals of that organization, so as to get them attached to the I. W. W. as directly chartered unions; and it was anticipated that similar treatment as accorded to the Amalgamated Society of Engineers would have produced the same results.

With this convention rests the responsibility of determining the standing of that organization, and the fear of a loss of membership should not induce the delegates to countenance special rules for special bodies, which, in their make-up, have not the slightest resemblance to an Industrial Union.

The International Union, while a part of the American Labor Union, paid in tax to that organization the total sum of \$177.54, and since being a part of the I. W. W. tax to the amount of \$451.91 has been paid to General Headquarters.

#### THE FINANCES OF THE ORGANIZATION.

The hardest problem to solve in the beginning was to devise a proper system to care for the finances of the organization. With such a small membership for the start, with a strike on hand immediately before enough money could be accumulated, it was many times but with the hardest endeavors, that the current expenses at general headquarters could be defrayed. Under the arrangements made that all unions formerly with the American Labor Union or Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance be furnished with a charter and seal free of cost it became necessary to contract debts with manufacturers, and the inability to pay after a lapse of time nearly endangered the very existence of the organization, when threats were made to disclose the real state of affairs to parties who were straining every nerve to see the smashing of the I. W. W., under the hope that the organization would not be able to meet the many obligations.

Personal loans had to be contracted to deposit money at the bank when the account was overdrawn, and for three months in succession the constant fear that these conditions would become known kept the

real workers on the administration from engaging enough assistance to carry on the necessary work during regulated hours.

In fact, until April, 1906, the assistance in the office was not adequate to cope with the increasing work, and when at last the conditions allowed a systematic arrangement in the office, the sudden discharge of two of the best workers nearly threw the entire machinery into chaos, and it is well to know that since July 15 I was compelled to work every week up to 85, and one week even up to 96 hours, to prevent the disorganization of the system, and keep it intact until the convention.

While the general executive board members examined the books in the sessions of January and July and found receipts and expenditures correctly entered and corresponding with the vouchers, yet they could not strike a balance, on account of the three different accounts kept. In the July session it was suggested and also a motion carried to engage expert accountants. The report made by them is now in the hands of the executive board members, but it should be made the property of this convention, and the recommendations of the expert accountants adopted, as they would in reality be my own recommendations to this convention. In addition to such recommendations made, the convention should adopt such rules as to protect the General Treasurer in his official transactions. No organizer, or officer of the organization, should receive any remuneration except he submits at least every second week a complete statement, itemized, no monies should be paid except passed upon and approved by the finance committee; such local finance committee ought to examine the books every three months and submit to all locals their findings, through the General Secretary-Treasurer. This is to prevent recurrences of what transpired within the past period, during which the General Secretary-Treasurer was compelled to pay bills under protest for services never rendered, or for such things as should be considered an insult and outrage against the entire membership. And for the further protection of the entire membership and those serving in the office, rules should be enacted preventing the arbitrary discharge of assistants in the office except for neglect of duty, and all assistants should have the right to appeal to some higher impartial board, when thinking that their discharge is not justified. The discipline in the office force should not be enforced by rules borrowed from the ruling class, as every assistant, when in reality an industrial worker, would unhesitatingly co-operate together to show the best results of the combined work done.

Lack of time was the cause of not having an itemized statement ready as to the amounts paid out for the various strikes; however, an accurate account has been given by every union that was engaged in conflicts with employers. All these accounts as sent in to headquarters are open for inspection, as also account is given of all monies sent by contributors to strikers directly, and not through the general office.

The conductors of the strikes were always held to give strict account of every cent expended, and from these reports the interested workers of this land would ascertain the fact that while the expenses for strike benefit were heavy not a cent has been paid for committee services rendered, as is the case in the craft union movement, (with but one exception.)

Were it not for the fact that the space of the Industrial Worker, it being a monthly paper only, was limited, all these strike accounts would have been published in the paper, as good propaganda material

among those who in their connections with former union movements, had to observe that a large share of expenses during conflicts with employers went in payment of committee and other expenses.

This convention should make such provisions that no officer need undergo the same predicaments as in the past period, and a certain latitude should be allowed to the general administration to appeal for funds when the funds get too low, so that the possibilities of meeting with the same obstacles be obliterated in this organization.

### STRIKES AND LOCKOUTS.

No strike of wealth-producers, whatever the circumstances, is unjustified, is without a motive cause, as long as such strike is aimed against the citadels of the employing class and the outposts. Unqualifiedly as is every lockout of wage-earners, under what pretense whatsoever precipitated by the employing class, a direct aim of the latter against the attempt of organized resistance by the producing class.

To withhold support from those engaged in such battles would mean the ignoring of all essential features that should constitute the militant labor organization.

When failures of strikes in the past gave cause to decry the cessation of work as an obsolete weapon in modern warfare with capitalism. strikes and lockouts, it is true, only if strikes are conducted and called by the mandates of one, or a few individuals. It is further true, that strikes cease to be effective when called at times when most opportune to the employers of labor. But a strike, as such, when carried on by a working-class organization industrially, is as much a thermometer upon which to measure the growing spirit of solidarity of the working-class, as any other medium that may be advocated by those who are striving for the better order of things.

All the strikes so far carried on by the Industrial Workers of the World, with but one exception, were governed by that principle of working-class solidarity, but in many instances such strikes were called in times when the general organization was least prepared, and when it required strenuous efforts to meet the requirements of such a conflict with the employers. Time has not permitted me to give to this convention a tabulated statement of the gains and losses; reasons for this neglect are many, but cannot be explained in this report to the convention. However, it should be a paramount duty of this gathering to so formulate the rules governing the Industrial Workers of the World that those in office, and entrusted with the direction of affairs, will not meet with such difficulties as they have within the past year. The experience in the past in the labor movement should give this convention a warning. Questions of such nature cannot be determined by sentimentalism—the stern, cruel facts should be considered, and then such provisions made by which the officers, as well as the rank and file, will be protected when engaged, or forced to be engaged in conflict with the owners of the tools of production.

### GROWTH OF THE ORGANIZATION.

Not for the purpose of showing large numbers is this report made to the delegates to this convention. But those now organized under the I. W. W., comparatively taken, only a few in the army of millions still unorganized, represent to-day the most enlightened, the most vigilant, the most aggressive and the only constructive force at work and in the battle of labor against the oppressors. Without their activity even our opponents of to-day among the members of our class would not

receive the consideration at the hands of exploiters which our militant labors alone have brought for them, as the employers are anxious to thwart off the inevitable by being cunningly lovely to those whom they can hold in their baneful influence and of their pliant tools, the labor fakirs, the criminals, wherever we see them at their dastardly work.

When the first review was made, three weeks after the adjournment of the first convention, it was found, on Aug. 1, 1905, that those brave men of the American Labor Union numbered then 1,100, and approximately 700 in the Metal Department, could not be swayed by the denunciations of the opposition in the West, those under cover as friends, often more dangerous than those openly fighting the I. W. W. These 1,900 constituted the only force with which the construction work was begun.

On September 1st the membership had increased to 4,247. The Socialist Trades and Labor Alliance had been enrolled with approximately 1,200 members. Then during September commenced the agitation with literature, with volunteer organizers, etc., and at the close of September the records show that the Metal Department paid for 840 members. In other unions directly attached, the membership had reached 4,238, a total of 5,078. November 1st compilation shows tax paid by the Metal Department on 840 members; others, 4,622 members; total, 5,462. December 1st, Metal Department still paying tax on 840 members; total membership, 7,971. On January 1st the Metal Department, working to get on a substantial foundation, still paid for 840 members; total membership, however, had reached the 8,200 mark. During January no increase could be recorded, for the nefarious work of our opponents had kept many workers away, and at the close of the month a decline to 7,817 was recorded. On March 1st compilation shows that the organization received tax on 1,500 members from the Metal Department. Transportation Department, nil. Tax from unions directly attached, 9,275, making a total membership of 10,775; April 1st shows that the Metal Department is firmly established, paying tax on 3,000 members; others, 10,228, making a total of 13,226. May 1st shows continuous growth; 3,000 in the Metal Department; 195 in the Transportation Department; 13,520 paying dues directly; total, 16,715.

The end of June will show an increase of 3,500 members, bringing the organization up to 21,000 members, the month of July brought an increase of 1,500, and during August, according to reports and taxes paid, about 2,500 new recruits joined the Industrial Workers of the World, bringing the organization up to 45,000 members, according to taxes paid; apart from those engaged in strikes, and those who are members of new unions chartered, who will not pay dues before next month.

These figures do not include the Mining Department, which is paying taxes on 22,000 members. However, if the full strength of the organization is to be measured, it may be stated that the Industrial Workers of the World comprise at present 60,000 members in department and local unions.

Industrial councils are organized, although not yet functioning everywhere with a dispatch and promptness, as would be the case if the importance of these bodies be recognized, in the following places:

New York City; Chicago, Ill.; St. Louis, Mo.; Flat River, Mo.; Cincinnati, Mo.; Paterson, N. J. In process of formation: Industrial Council of Cleveland, Arizona District Ind. Council, Seattle, Wash., Industrial Council, Toronto, Can., Industrial Council.

In this connection it is perhaps worthy of note, that the Metal and Machinery Department is also issuing Industrial Council charters to such central bodies, as consist of unions composed of wage earners employed in those industries. This convention will have to determine whether such is in accord with the basic structural rules of the I. W. W.

#### STRUCTURE OF INDUSTRIAL UNIONISM.

Although the first convention of the Industrial Workers of the World in an elaborate display of words by many delegates, has formulated the plans upon which the Industrial Workers of the World were to be organized, and has laid a foundation, yet there are apparently so many divergent opinions on the subject, that it is absolutely necessary to readjust and improve upon the foundation, and the convention should place itself on record on this important point, what in reality comprises an industrial union, or a unit thereof. Taking the structure of capitalist society as an example, and also the United States census report, we find the industries of this country subdivided according, and grouped by departments, and industries of departments. The employees of the various industries are not grouped according to their crafts, but according to their industrial occupation. It follows, therefore, that the smallest unit of an industrial union comprises the employees in one industrial plant, organized irrespective of the machine at which employed, and irrespective of the place at which exploited for the profit of the masters, and that all employees be merged together into one union of employees of that respective plant, whether large or small. Likewise should all the employees of industrial corporations, no matter where, and at what place employed, be members in that respective department of wage-earners if already organized. Taking, for illustration, the Mining Department: It should embrace within its folds not only the metalliferous, the coal and the salt miners, all the employees in the oil and gas fields, and the various plants connected with that industry, but also the employees in oil and gas refineries, the teamsters and distributors of oil, and any other mining products in the large or small industrial centers. They all should belong to the same department in which the workers in the mines, or in the oil fields, are organized.

This should form the basis and foundation, and when upon this the structure will be erected, it will be lasting, and permanent, and jurisdiction fights as to what department certain employees do belong would disappear.

But while this is the basis and the prospective structure of an industrial union, yet we must reckon with the conditions, and consider the fact that the labor movement is passing through a transitory stage, and that it is well nigh impossible to organize the wage-earners in their entirety in one union, except the preparatory work is done by a few, and the knowledge of industrial unionism disseminated among those who are to-day still unorganized, or divided into the various craft unions, often against their own will. It became, therefore, necessary to organize unions apparently on craft union lines, and objections have been raised against such mode of procedure, or apparent compromise with an adopted conception. As a safeguard against the possible drifting of such unions into permanent craft organizations, it should be understood, and made mandatory, that as soon as a union of employees in any given industry is formed, all those in such craft unions must transfer to the respective industrial body, and become active in the affairs of said industrial union. But all recruiting craft

unions should be chartered directly from the general administration, so that constant control can be kept over the affairs of such organizations, and the proper alignment be directed as soon as such appears to be opportune and necessary.

#### INDUSTRIAL COUNCILS.

If it is the final object of the Industrial Workers of the World to prepare the government for the co-operative commonwealth, then, likewise, should provisions be made to organize the agency, through which the administration of cities and rural districts be conducted.

The Industrial Council should, therefore, be organized for that purpose, and the territory to be covered by such organization should be determined by the central administration. Universal rules, only to be amended according to the requirements of given localities, should be adopted by the convention, or the general administration of the Industrial Workers of the World.

While the future functions of such councils will consist in the administration of the industries by the chosen representatives of the various industrial unions, their present-day duties should be to direct the propaganda, the organizing work, the education through central agencies, the direction of strikes, and other means of warfare between the workers and the shirkers, and the supervision of organizers; in fact, all such functions, as will yield better results, if carried out by a collective direction, should come within the jurisdiction sphere of such councils.

Were it possible to have such rules adopted that all membership books be made out in either the offices of the departments and general office respectively, then it should devolve on this convention to decide that only one charter for wage earners in any given industry or industrial plant be granted in a given locality, and, through that central local agency, the branching out according to the requirements of the industry should be arranged, so as to organize rapidly responding and coherent connections between the various branches of an industry, all parts of one central industrial union.

Likewise, should every industrial union be represented in the Industrial, or District Councils, wherever organized, and, as it should be made mandatory on the workers to take an active part in the administration of affairs concerning their interests, and the agencies for the protection of those interests, so should it also be made obligatory on every union to be represented in Industrial City or District Councils, so that in cases of emergency all orders emanating from the General Office, or arising from development in local conditions, can be executed with the dispatch and complete discipline necessary in a working class movement. The matter of Industrial Councils and the creation of universal laws governing the duties and rights of such councils should have the attention of this convention, so that the working class will receive the benefit of the combined intelligence of the delegates here assembled.

#### REDUCTION OF DUES.

As soon as the Industrial Workers of the World raised the banner of revolt against the existing institutions supporting the capitalist class, including the union controlled by capitalist interests, the forces of opposition immediately realized the danger, and prepared immediately to thwart the efforts for organizing the workers on the right lines. The proletarians of this country, grasping with outstretched hands for the opportunity to organize for concerted action, found themselves imme-



diately surrounded by all those who serve the masters as pliant tools. The cobwebs of ignorance once brushed away from their brain and eyes, made many of them feel that their place was no longer in institutions organized for the perpetuation of the system of to-day. Many began to organize and become members of the Industrial Workers of the World. The unions of this organization commenced to grow, interest became so manifest, that these enthusiasts predicted the downfall of the old by sudden collapse, and the construction of the new by leaps and bounds, but they did not reckon with the forces combined against them. Seven international unions, connected with the American Federation of Labor, immediately threw the ban of condemnation against all those who were beginning to assert their manhood, by voluntarily joining the Industrial Workers of the World, even though they were forced by the power of the capitalist combinations to remain members of those unions still attached to the American Federation of Labor. But the question of being compelled to pay dues to the old organization became also an obstacle against joining the I. W. W. In many places arrangements were made to allow those, who were compelled to pay tax to the old organizations, to have a reduction payable to the general headquarters, usually amounting to ten cents per month per member; these ten cents to be used for propaganda purposes to spread the light, and organize those who had not yet seen the difference between antiquated craft unionism and a progressive union movement. The results of these arrangements were such, that hundreds of workers commenced to support financially the Industrial Workers of the World, thinking by continuing the propaganda among those disinterested, that it might be possible to have large bodies of workers in the various industries break away from the old moorings and start to participate in the constructive work planned and carried on by the Industrial Workers of the World.

Since the danger became so imminent with the arousing of the workers everywhere, and fearing the disintegration of the large combinations, controlled only by the enormous combinations wielded by the mutual co-operation between capital and labor, the leaders of these international unions, notably the International Association of Machinists, the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, the United Cloth Cap and Hat Makers, the United Brotherhood of Leather Workers, and others, decreed that the mere joining of the Industrial Workers of the World would deprive any man or woman of the right to work in industries controlled by these combinations. Many had dared to defy the edicts of these labor lieutenants. Many others, compelled by the consideration of their material interest, had to submit to the mandates of these czars in a so-called trade-union movement.

Those defiant ones should be permitted to carry on the propaganda among their fellow men, and this can only be done by making such arrangements that the burden of paying taxes to two organizations be somewhat relaxed, and that those who are compelled to be members of the American Federation of Labor desirous of sharing in the work of the Industrial Workers of the World, be allowed a remittance of a portion of the dues as provided for in the constitution.

#### THE COLLECTIVE WILL OF THE MEMBERSHIP.

"All power should rest in the collective membership." With this proclamation standing before the toilers of America, as a part of that historic manifesto, this convention should, to be true to those who make up the organization, again reaffirm that the supreme authority

in the affairs of the I. W. W. should be the collective will of an educated and enlightened membership.

Errors may be made by that collectively,—they will be righted by the same, who are responsible and will blame themselves for the errors made; mistakes may occur, throwing the entire organization into convulsions, but all that is preferable to the domination of a few over the destinies of a large body of workers. When their collective expression directs the affairs of the organization, the members of our class will learn to be self-reliant, they will drive and train themselves to avoid mistakes, and prevent repetition of same; they will become ready for the enormous task before them and the danger of stampedes and disintegration will disappear, and also the nonsensical subterfuge for the continuation of a brutal system cannot be advanced “that the people is not ready for a complete and unrestricted economic freedom.”

Therefore, no act of this convention should become law before approved after an intelligent explanation, by the members, comprising the organization; no officer, nor organizer, nor a trusted part of the administration, should serve, except by carrying out the mandates of those whom he serves, whether on the general administration or in the performance of duties in a locality. Thus, the membership should have cognizance of all transactions within the organization, and all affairs in connection with administering the same, and all channels for the expression of thought and criticism be free and unobstructed.

Men, and women, whose life's work is devoted to the greatest cause since the dawn of time, when fearlessly serving the class that alone holds the framework of society together, will not fear the honest criticism of the proletarians, howsoever poor in language it may be.

In contrast with the generally accepted views is perhaps the idea to consider all officers of any labor organization the servants of the whole, especially when they are paid for services rendered. Not servants, though, in the sense as applied by the capitalist masters in their relation to an exploited wage slave, but as equals guided in their actions and deliberations by an intelligent working class.

The supreme duty of this convention should be to insert into the governing rules for this organization such provisions, by means of which the quoted paragraph of the Industrial Union manifesto will find its expression and execution in fact.

#### THE INDUSTRIAL WORKERS AND THE FARMERS.

One of the burning questions that should have the attention of this convention appertains to the relations between the workers engaged in production of commodities in factories, mines and mills, and those engaged in the cultivation of land, and the work incident to the raising of farm products.

Complicated as this question appears to be, judging from the divergent views held by the many correspondents with headquarters of the I. W. W., there should be only one consideration in the forming of a judgment and the adoption of rules for the direction of the next officers and organizers of the Industrial Workers of the World.

In no country of the world has it been better demonstrated that the co-operation between the wealth producers in city and on the land is essential to the success of revolutionary movements than in France and recently in Russia, and failures are due to the absence of that co-operation. But the advocates of a mistaken idea, that the farmer, as owner of land, has interest in common with laborers, and that therefore the existing farmers' organizations should be invited for mutual co-operation do not seem to realize that the battle of the farmer against

the corporations and railroads is not the battle of the wage earners for the full product of their labor. As an exploiter of labor during harvest days the farm-owner is the most cruel master and labor-fleece, and, when the supply of available labor for the few summer months becomes scarce, he will employ the same vicious tricks as the capitalist in cities, and through deception and fraudulent games endeavor to delude the sellers of labor power to fill the shortage in supply. But he, the farmer, will not think of making voluntarily the working conditions of the farm employes such, that the laborers, leaving the overstocked labor market of the cities will find more advantageous to themselves on the land.

The organization of farm employes is therefore necessary, so that in the periods when the demand of laborers for the farms exceeds the possible supply, such working conditions may be obtained for the farm laborer, as to enable him also to see the necessity of co-operation with the workers in the cities for the establishing of conditions, under which the private ownership of land and all implements of production will be abolished and the exploitation by owners of factories or of farm land will cease.

In countries like the United States and Canada, in which state boundary lines are used as subterfuge to prevent labor legislation on national lines, it is well nigh impossible to demand the suppression of private employment agencies, the unscrupulous sharks, through whom the farm exploiters are able to deceive and lure into their serfdom many an unfortunate worker from the city, who, unprotected, has no choice but to submit to get sufficient money together to escape the veritable hell work on the farms during the harvest and other days.

Only an organization of these farm employes, systematically conducted, will be able to secure the required protection to these members of our class.

For this work of organizing the farm laborers we must look for actual support to the thousands and hundreds of thousands of wage earners in the lumber camps of the United States and Canada.

No element is so faithful to the principle when once understood as the hard-working pioneer proletarians in the woods, nor a group of toilers who will fight more vigorously for their rights than those who, with pride, call themselves the lumber jacks. Their relation with the farm laborers, the fluctuating character of their employment should serve as the key to open the field for the organizing of the farm wage slaves.

In the summer months most of the lumbermen work as farm hands or in the saw mills, and many a blacklisted mechanic from industrial centers seeks, as a last refuge from the master's persecution, employment as constantly shifting farm laborer and lumberman.

The Industrial Workers of the World have organized and are organizing with astonishing success the lumbermen in different parts of the country. Thousands of them have joined the I. W. W. in the last few months; in many places the shifting volunteer advocates of Industrial Unionism have conducted the movements for the improved working conditions in the lumber camps; literature is being poured into the camps, and the work of education and organizing is carried on with incessant activity.

But the lumbermen and saw-mill employes should not be contented with obtaining a protection during only a part of the year while engaged in their hard work in the woods and mills. They should conceive that their own condition will be jeopardized if the I. W. W. fails to organize the workers in the fields in which they seek and secure

employment during the remainder of the year; that is mostly in agricultural occupations. They should assist in organizing the farm laborer and carry the propaganda for Industrial Unionism all the year around among their fellow workers in their lines of activity, and then they will be assured that their card deposited in organizations of farm laborers guarantees them the same protection as they have secured now while being members of the same organization and employed in the lumber camps and saw-mills during the other parts of the year.

But to assure a successful protection of farm laborers and lumbermen it is absolutely necessary to get the organizations so organized in direct touch, through the general administration of the I. W. W., with the organizations of industrial workers in the cities.

This must be done so that the central organizations and unions may immediately set the propaganda committees into motion and acquaint the workers in the industrial centers with the prevailing conditions in the various agricultural and lumber districts during such times when inducements are offered by the employment sharks to get into those districts a greater number of wage earners in excess of what is needed, so that through such surplus of labor they can more successfully compel the wage earner to submit to a lower standard of livelihood.

Great results, surprising even to the advocates of an industrial democracy, as by the organized efforts of farm, agricultural and forest workers, have been achieved in such countries in which the high importance of these toilers was understood by all those struggling for the emancipation of the wealth producers; greater still will be the achievements, quicker will come the day of labor's victory, if this convention will adopt such measures, whereby that much desired co-operation of farm and forest workers with the city proletariat will be established, and the future work of the I. W. W. be mapped out by the combined intelligence of those assembled here.

#### THE LABEL QUESTION.

In the literature placed before, the interested wage earners of the land, the salient points of difference between an emblem representing working-class solidarity, as the universal label of the I. W. W. should, and a trade-union label serving the interests of the capitalist sellers of commodities, was not sufficiently emphasized, partly due to lack of time of those in the general office, who, by taking care of that most important part of constructive work, had to slight the also important destructive propaganda against capitalist-controlled institutions. The advocacy of a universal label appears to be a compromise, and for that reason alone have ardent members advocated its abolition.

While it is true that through the label propaganda of the craft unions the interests of a certain per centage of manufacturers were benefited at the expense of the bread-winners, and although it cannot be denied that it served as a club to force into submission many a militant body of workers at the behest of the employers of labor, and suppress any rebellion against the oppression of the master, often used on goods of inferior quality for the purpose of holding a market for manufacturers, who have combined with labor leaders in an unholy alliance, yet the fundamental causes that led to the creation of a universal label should also be taken into consideration before the future attitude of the Industrial Workers of the World on the label question is determined and decided on.

Proceeding from the theory that the combination of pure and simple unions with employers of labor for the mutual protection of what

they think to be their mutual interests, a large portion of the wage earners in this country have been poisoned with the erroneous idea that the "union label" stood for fair working conditions, and for this reason alone have thousands of the unsophisticated given support to the propaganda for union labeled goods.

A power of oppression has thus been created by the workers, unconsciously though to most of them, and placed in the hands of the agents of the employers at the head of craft unions, a weapon used for the persecution of members of the I. W. W. and others, who dare to rebel against the wrongs heaped upon them.

This power, wielded by the many holding erroneous ideas in their collective capacity, should be destroyed; but for this purpose an emblem symbolizing the solidarity of the wage earners in its coherent, invincible might, should be used to call the attention of those whom we expect, in days to come, to become the component parts of the I. W. W., to the differences between craft divided organizations and one that intends to and will unite the workers on both the economic, the most essential field, as well as on the political, so as to give expression in augmenting numbers, of the will-power of the producers to shape the destinies of society in conformity to the needs of those constituting its pillars and upholders.

The universal label should, therefore, be only used as an emblem of working class solidarity; it should never be placed in the hands of manufacturers, should never be advertised by employers of labor; at least, not with the permission of the organization and its component parts, as a medium of protection of the goods of manufacturers, and its issuance should be in complete control of the unions comprising the I. W. W.

This convention should adopt stringent rules for the control over the label, and never permit the prostitution of same for the benefit of manufacturers and employers. It should be used as a rammer against the craft unions' label strongholds, so as to demolish forever that emblem of compromise and corruption, and thus hasten the day when the only emblem of working class interests and labor's solidarity will be the filled halls and meeting rooms, in which the enlightened workers of the world will assemble to administer the affairs of the industries of this land, and the world over.

#### PROPOSED RELATIONS WITH WORKING-CLASS ORGANIZATIONS ABROAD.

The first convention of the Industrial Workers of the World, recognizing the fact that the solidarity of all wage earners throughout the world must be established, had instructed the Secretary to immediately communicate with all such organizations of continental Europe, as well as other countries, as are organized on the same basic principles as the Industrial Workers of the World, for the purpose of establishing such international relations and connections as are outlined in the programme. Not on account of neglect of duty, but because of the conditions within the Industrial Workers of the World when organized, it was found advisable to await another convention of the Industrial Workers of the World, so as to be able to present a plan for mutual co-operation with such organizations abroad.

The enormous foreign element emigrating to the United States every year comes to this country almost unorganized, and those who participated in the conflicts of labor in their native land, usually fail to find

the necessary connections so as to continue their activity on this side of the ocean.

This convention should instruct the incoming Executive Board of the Industrial Workers of the World to immediately find the necessary agencies in Europe, so that emigrants to this country, before leaving, will already be furnished with all the information necessary, and be enlightened, as to the real conditions in the United States, and an appeal should be made to them to immediately join the existing organizations of the Industrial Workers of the World, immediately after they accept employment in any industry. The literature of the Industrial Workers of the World should be distributed in different languages, in the various emigration ports in Europe, and central bureaus be established by the Industrial Workers of the World in American harbors, and be opened to the emigrants, and information should be furnished to them how they could best enlist themselves, and participate in the struggles of organized labor against the oppressors and owner of the factories, mines and mills.

But for this purpose, the various administrations of progressive unions in the various parts of the world should be communicated with, and the necessary connection established for the mutual execution of an international program, in conformity with the principles of the Industrial Workers of the World.

#### THE LABOR PRESS SUPPORTING THE I. W. W.—BASIS FOR MUTUAL CO-OPERATION.

The press, once proclaimed the fifth of the "Great Powers," today wields even a farther reaching influence than in times of yore, and while masters whose economic interests are voiced and guarded by the press and owned and controlled by them, it is also used as an agency for the mind-chloroforming of the workers through capitalist class economics, ethics and morals. That press, voicing the interests of the wealth producers, should, of equal importance as a militant organization itself, be made the most powerful instrument for the preparation and education of the toilers in working class economies.

Weak, as compared with the labor press of continental Europe, is the press serving the interests of the toiling masses in America, yet the thirst for more knowledge is growing apparently and ostensibly among the millions of wealth producers, and the organs of the Industrial Workers of the World should be made the agencies to disseminate ideas and the knowledge among them, so as to teach them what would serve their interests best in the struggle for existence and emancipation.

But the Industrial Worker, as the official organ of the I. W. W., a publication in the English language, will not reach those thousands who will never be able to learn the language of their adopted land. This knowledge must be brought to them in their native tongue, and the missionary message of the Industrial Workers of the World conveyed to them through channels other than the paper mentioned.

An army of wage earners unable to be reached by English literature and the English press may be aroused if the propaganda is conducted with the support of a press and by literature in the language they best command.

A basis of mutual co-operation between labor papers published in the various languages and the Industrial Worker, or such organs selected by this convention, should be established, so that such papers will periodically devote some space of the paper to the dissemination

of the principles underlying the foundation of the I. W. W., and acquaint the readers with all occurrences and transactions within the organization.

If this convention will provide for an educational bureau, as had been contemplated by the first convention, said bureau, through its substations, should be entrusted with the work of formulating such mutual *modus-operandi* that all those who wish to post themselves on affairs in the I. W. W. will be able to receive such information through the labor press in the language they prefer.

This convention should not fail to voice in the most expressive way the gratitude we owe to the various papers supporting the Industrial Workers of the World, so that these papers may henceforth receive also the support of the proletarians in the hard struggle to hold their own against the combined forces of the capitalist class and the prejudice, begotten by ignorance, of class-interests these papers are defending and fighting for.

### THE FIRST OF MAY.

The first convention of the Industrial Workers of the World, in declaring for the universal solidarity of the working class the world over, has fittingly adopted the 1st of May as the only labor day not granted to the wage-earners by the class in power, but conquered through sacrifices and hard battles as the International Labor Day, and the members of the organization were directed to present, through proper manifestations, the growing solidarity of labor in the battle for final emancipation.

Great and glorious as is the 1st of May—the International Labor Day of the United proletariat, yet it would be a delusion and a snare were the workers to celebrate that day with the consent of the employing class. To demonstrate by parades and great display of music and uniforms would place the International Labor Day of world producers on an equal basis with the labor day celebrated with the consent of the master-class in this country on the first Monday in September. The proletarians of this country should be made acquainted with the fact that the idea of an International 1st of May Labor Day was conceived by the pioneers of the labor movement in this country, and that its celebration was to mean a demonstration of the growing might and power of a discontented working-class, not only in the United States, but in every part of the world where capitalist production has produced also the homeless *proletaire*. If the 1st of May is to be celebrated only by speech-making in the evening, the day loses its impressive character, and ceases to be a day conquered by the organized forces of the wealth producers. The 1st of May should be marked, wherever possible, by cessation of work, and turning out in bodies, not led by labor lieutenants, who, appropriating to themselves the fruits of labor's effort, lead the ignorant to the shambles.

Work should cease on the 1st of May wherever the Industrial Workers of the World are strong enough, and inspired with the principle that gave birth to that day. The cessation should not be done with the consent of the exploiters. A disciplined army of proletarians should be able to cease production wherever strong enough, and commence production on the day following the 1st of May, and take care of those who may be victimized for being active in the movement. No strike should be inaugurated on that very same day for improved working conditions; that would obscure the issue and cloud the very character

of the celebration. It should be merely a demonstration for a great principle, and if it can be inaugurated successfully once, the workers of this land will rally around the banners, if the issue is made clear by proper propaganda and agitation by those who are the advocates of a better order of things. This convention, therefore, should not be satisfied with half measures; it should sound the right chord, and appeal to the workers to join hands with all the proletarians the world over to demonstrate, not their satisfaction with the existing conditions, not the desire to live in harmony with the exploiters of labor, but to express in words, backed up by the might of the organized forces, that the struggles of the workers of this land are the struggles of the downtrodden the world over.

In a country where the soil is strewn with the bodies of martyrs to the labor movement, and the blood of the best men and women has penetrated the fertile soil, and prepared it for results to be reaped by coming generations, the representatives of a people that may be considered backward by reactionists, even enforced the will of the people a year ago on the 1st of May, and as a glorious example to the proletarians the world over, the Douma of Russia refused to meet on that day in commemoration of the heroic deeds of those who had fought the battles for freedom, not only there but in every civilized country of the world.

Feeling confident that this convention will do its duty in this case, I have laid the facts before you. The responsibility now lies in your hands.

#### THE CONSPIRACY OF THE MINE OWNERS OF THE WEST.

Drenched with the blood of martyrs for the cause of labor is the soil of the American continent, and a new chapter of tragic history would have been added, were it not for the fact that tens of years of agitation, no matter by whom conducted and under what name, had broken the spell of dense ignorance, so long keeping in apathy the class of the downtrodden.

"Shall our brothers be murdered?" the battle cry flashing through the land from and to all corners, found an echo, unexpected even by those, who, fully aware of the criminal character of the conspiracy enacted by the ruling class, fully alive to their duties toward those who were persecuted, not as individuals, but as the human expression of the growing working class solidarity, so dreaded by the capitalist class, had issued the call for concerted action by all hosts of labor, irrespective of their former differences, calling on them to rally to the support of those who lay languishing in jail, were condemned to die, if the conspirators had their will. Their voices stifled because they dared to be true while alive, might have passed unnoticed even by those for whom they raised their voices while alive.

No! was the response of thousands and tens of thousands, who, aroused by the commanding voices of the stalwarts of the Industrial Workers of the World, raised their mighty arm of protest, and what has been done by our comrades throughout the land alone, would have justified the existence of this organization, as the organized instrument for action when deemed necessary.

Money and the best legal talent would not have been able to save the lives of Chas. H. Moyer, W. D. Haywood, Geo. A. Pettibone and Vincent St. John; their dead bodies would today again bear testimony to the outrages perpetrated by the class, controlling the resources of



this land and all institutions of oppression, were it not for the vigilance of the few, but determined and drilled men of the I. W. W., who, facing all the calumnies of the public press, the curses hurled at them by the agents of the capitalist masters, by day and night in danger of being arrested themselves, threw their lives on the scale in order to raise the issue: "We must prevent the judicial murder." Trembling as the result of the spontaneous arising, fearing the unification of the forces of labor for a grand cause the conspirators have not dared to carry out to the end their nefarious plot.

The battle is not over yet—but will be won, if the agitation, the education, the organizing work is continued.

The object-lesson given to the workers of this land by this incident should serve as a guide for future action. Calls for armed resistance with an unorganized, divided working class with the power of an organized government pitted against them, backing up the arms and guns of those drilled and trained to shoot and kill every one who dares to deny the permanency of this system, or those who cry out for justice against the capitalist tyranny, would be tantamount to leading the workers to the shambles,—defeated and despairing, it would take decades to redeem the lost positions. But a repetition of similar brazen challenges to the working class can and must be prevented; what today has occurred in Colorado and Idaho, may reoccur in any part of this country, and prepared for the occasion must be the thousands who are feeling every day that the despotism of a class, which realizes that the days of doom draw near, will stoop down to the perpetration of the most appalling crimes against the advocates of working class solidarity, working class unity, working class aims and aspirations, and working class emancipation.

The Industrial Workers of the World, through the agitation carried on, has halted the arm outstretched to stifle the voices of our fellow-workers in the cause; on the actions of this convention will it depend, whether the working class will be able to keep the proletarians aroused and organized for the prevention of more of such conspiracies, aimed, in every instance, against the institution organized by the wage earners for their battles against the employing class and all its strongholds.

#### CONCLUSION.

It was to be expected that the officers of the American Federation of Labor, as servants of the corporations and employers' associations, through their connection with the National Civic Federation, would immediately start a campaign of slander and abuse against those who joined the Industrial Workers of the World. While some of our would-be friends and intellectual advisers, self-appointed, would hold up their hands in horror and warn the I. W. W. against organizing workers already within the folds of the American Federation of Labor, and would give their kind counsel to confine the agitation to those not at all organized, they were the first ones to quibble and shout as soon as the I. W. W. started out to organize those who were denied admission into any organization connected with the American Federation of Labor. So vicious and unscrupulous have these tools of the exploiters become in their warfare that strike-breakers were engaged by the A. F. of L. officers to take the places of members of the I. W. W. In Youngstown, Ohio, in San Pedro in Yonkers; and in many other places committees were sent, to employers, demanding the discharge of I. W. W. supporters; special boycotts have been declared against the goods made

in factories where members of the I. W. W. are employed, as, for instance, in St. Louis, Mo., and Butte, Mont., and every effort imaginable is made to destroy the growing power of the I. W. W., and prevent the coming together of the workers on the economic and political field. To the credit of the workers of this land may it be said that the villifications, the slanders, and the abuse against the organization have had but little effect; the solidarity of the I. W. W. members in every dispute with employers had earned for them the respect of the honest workers. In Schenectady, where the I. W. W. efforts gained advantages for others, too; in Cleveland, Ohio, where I. W. W. bricklayers walked out on strike in sympathy with striking hodcarriers, members of the A. F. of L., and refused an offer of a ten per cent increase in wages and a closed shop contract if they would desert the building laborers, which they refused to do; in Newark, N. J., where I. W. W. shoemakers refused to work with strikebreakers engaged to defeat strikers of another organization not in the I. W. W., and similar cases can be recorded to show that the I. W. W. members are not organized for the purpose of retaliation against members of their class engaged in warfare with the employers of labor.

Yet the struggle against the foes will be hard and a gigantic task. But if this convention of the I. W. W. will strictly adhere to the lines of construction mapped out in the first manifesto issued; if aware of their duties toward the working class, all delegates to this convention will improve upon and build the structure on a stronger and more firm foundation, which, erected by the combined work and intelligence of an enlightened working class, will be stable, then the proletarians, regaining hope and confidence, freed from the fetters of antiquated craft unionism and the destructive influence of capitalist tools, will rally around the banner unfurled by the Industrial Workers of the World and march on to victory, which, in its wake, will establish the economic freedom of the constructors and builders of the mills, factories and palaces of the world.

The last convention laid the foundation. Crude and inadequate as the constitution appears to be, insufficient even in its make-up to materialize the expectation of those who had issued the call, the fact that the powerful forces lying dormant and latent and the spirit of unrest waiting to be led into channels for useful and effective manifestation, gave assurance that the Industrial Workers of the World was born at an hour most needed. None too soon for the despairing forces of labor did the young giant enter into the ring, and, in recognition of these facts, those who stood the brunt of battles in the past anticipated that at the beginning they would not have big "numbers" to parade with, as numbers don't count if the motive force for action is absent.

Confident that the delegates to the convention will realize the magnitude of the work before us all, also aware of the fact that you recognize in the criminal proceedings instituted against those who were instrumental in launching the Industrial Workers of the World, an attempt at destruction of a real labor organization by a class trembling at the consequence that a peaceful revolution in the brains of the workers will have on the system under which few are allowed to oppress and to rule, and would continue if they could destroy the organization founded on the recognition of the war between the classes, I need not offer any apology for what little could be done in a little over one year of existence of this organization. The ground has been

broken, the soil has been tilled, the seed has been sown in every industrial city and town of this land. With the co-operation of all those striving for a better plan and system, the task will be accomplished and, when the toilers of America, organized and trained in the school of Industrial Unionism, will put into execution the program embodied in the preamble of the Industrial Workers of the World, you all, in better days to come, will be entitled to the gratitude that a world of free men and women will owe to the pioneers and vanguard fighters in the struggle for emancipation.

The report of the Secretary-Treasurer was received with applause.

DEL. SIMS: I wish, brother delegates, to offer three cheers for the best revolutionary document ever offered to the working class.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Sit down and keep quiet, will you? (Laughter.)

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: You have heard the reading of the reports of your president and your secretary-treasurer. What is the further pleasure of the convention in regard to those reports and the disposal that you desire to be made of them? Your chairman is of the opinion that if these reports were referred to a committee, that committee would be in a position to assist your Constitution Committee in taking those parts that pertain to the constitution and referring them to the Constitution Committee, and yet keep the secretary's report and the president's report intact.

DEL. DE LEON: Mr. Chairman—

DEL. McMULLEN: I would like to ask a question.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Just a minute, Del. DeLeon. Delegate McMullen asks the privilege of asking a question.

DEL. McMULLEN: I do not rise to make a motion at all. I would like to know if the duties of the general secretary of this organization are not all in line and in the nature of what this president and secretary's duties are in administration, and should we not hear their reports and have them all referred to a committee? Then you have the full working of the organization, that is, of the administrative part of it. I have no objection to what you do, but I only ask that question.

DEL. DE LEON: Before I make my motion I wish to know whether I correctly understood Del. McMullen. I understood his question to imply that there were some more reports coming. Am I right?

DEL. McMULLEN: There certainly must be some meetings of the general executive board which were executive and administrative.

DEL. DE LEON: I would ask the chair if there are any more reports coming. If there are any more reports I shall take my seat.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The only report I know of from the Executive Board would be the reading of the minutes of its different sessions.

DEL. DE LEON: Well, then, I am ready to make my motion. Mr. Chairman, this convention, after quite a long struggle, elected a Committee on Constitution. I listened carefully to the reading of the two reports. I remember but one recommendation made that referred—that could possibly refer—to anything but the Committee on Constitution. That was the recommendation made by the president with regard to the funds for the Moyer-Haywood-Pettibone trial. Outside of that every point touched upon, and every recommendation made, unless any escaped me,—and I was keeping track of them—refers exclusively to matters of constitutional provision. So, being of that conviction, I

cannot see in the suggestion to elect another committee to which these two reports shall be referred, anything but a taking from the Committee on Constitution matters that come exclusively within its province. For that reason I move you that these two reports be printed in circular form and furnished to the members of this convention, and that as soon as printed both of them be referred to the Committee on Constitution. Has the secretary taken down my motion?

DEL. SMITH: I second that motion.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: It has been regularly moved and supported that the two reports just read be printed in circular form and distributed amongst the delegates and referred to the Constitution Committee. You have heard the motion as stated. Are you ready for the question? (Question called for.)

DEL. RYAN: Mr. Chairman, it is understood by the motion of Del. DeLeon that this thing is to be done immediately; is that it?

DEL. DELEON: Oh, yes. I cannot imagine that my motion could imply that it be done after this convention adjourned.

DEL. RYAN: Well, I want to understand.

DEL. DELEON: I move that it be done forthwith, so that the members of this convention can get the reports to read, and that as soon as they are in that condition they be referred to the Committee on Constitution. There is one recommendation only that I remember which properly belongs to the Committee on Resolutions, and I can tell you that the Committee on Constitution—whose chairman I am not—that we are quite certain that we have quite enough on our hands, and that we shall not act as good judges do proverbially, extend our jurisdiction. We shall not try to trespass on the jurisdiction of the Committee on Resolutions. Whatever recommendations in that report we have overlooked and that belongs there, we shall be only too glad to pass over to the Committee on Resolutions as quickly as it can be done. It is to be printed immediately.

PRESIDENT SHERMAN: I want to ask the mover of the motion if he would permit a change in a typographical error?

DEL. DELEON: Certainly.

PRESIDENT SHERMAN: It reads 30,000 where it should be 60,000.

DEL. DELEON: That is understood. That is simply the correction of an error like a missing letter on the part of a printer.

PRESIDENT SHERMAN: It passes out of my hands, and I don't want to do anything of that kind without an understanding.

DEL. McMULLEN: Mr. President, in the form of this motion I cannot vote upon it as I would wish to. I want this matter printed and each delegate and local organization to receive a copy, especially each delegate. But I do not want it referred to the Constitution Committee. I am opposed to that part of it, and when we get ready to vote I shall ask that the question be divided so that I can vote on the two questions that are in it.

DEL. DELEON: I consent to have the question divided.

DEL. McMULLEN: I certainly, sir, thank you. Now, on the question of referring, or referring it to the Constitution Committee: In my judgment this should go to a special committee, and when they find parts that refer to the constitution they should refer them back to this organization and then to the Constitution Committee. Where they find parts that refer to organization there should be a committee of that sort, and they should go to that. And where they find parts referring to ways and means there should be a committee of that sort and those parts should go to it. I believe that is the way, because I believe we

all recognize that we are not yet thoroughly formed; we are not a thorough working body at this time, with only one working committee, that is, the Committee on Constitution, and I do not presume that this committee was elected with the understanding that they will work—those seven men—and the balance of us do nothing. Now, if that is the idea—and there were many ideas contained in the report especially of the Secretary-Treasurer; it was most voluminous; it was long, and I want to say that from my observation or hearing of it it appeared to be quite thorough—it would be preposterous to presume that seven men could take into consideration those many different parts and what they treat upon and then handle it so that this convention could in any sense adjourn by the end of this week. That is the reason, Mr. President, that I called your attention to the necessity of a special committee to segregate its parts and then consider the special parts that might require special recommendation.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: I would take it that the segregation question is with the consent of the mover of the motion. I would be of the opinion that his motion at this time, through his consent, is that the two reports be printed for the purpose of distributing them amongst the delegates.

DEL. McMULLEN: Very well.

DEL. DE LEON: That was the purpose.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Am I correct?

DEL. DE LEON: That was the purpose.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: That is the motion that is before the house at this time, and then will come action on the question of referring.

DEL. McMULLEN: Then I have no objection. I ask unanimous consent that it be voted on.

DEL. McDONALD: I ask for information; is the secretary supposed to submit his financial statement along with his report, or is he going to bring that in afterwards?

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: That is a question that the Chair is not in a position to answer, for the simple reason that I have not got that knowledge.

DEL. McDONALD: Well, I would like to know, Mr. Chairman, if the secretary can submit a report to this convention without submitting a financial statement to the organization. It seems to me that is vitally important to this organization, and somebody is supposed to furnish that statement to this convention. In fact, I shall insist on that, that this convention receive from the secretary a report of the income of this organization since he has taken office.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The Chair would take it that that matter can be taken up after his report is acted on.

DEL. McDONALD: I maintain that we cannot receive the secretary's report without that is added to it, without having that in it.

PRESIDENT SHERMAN: I believe the secretary has mentioned the fact that his financial affairs have been audited by an expert.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Yes.

PRESIDENT SHERMAN: Hence I would believe that he expected that that financial report would be included with his report. It is to be reported any way, and I can not see where there would be any objection to have it all come out in the same report, his financial report and his general report. It has to be reported any way, and it will be reported. He mentions a fact there in which he couples, I should judge, his financial report with his general report; and while he is not on the

floor himself, I believe he would have no objection. I do not see where there could be any objection to having the two come out in one report.

DEL. DE LEON: I must admit that that point did not occur to me.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: I realize that.

DEL. DE LEON: I must admit that the president refreshed my memory on the subject. I must admit that if I had thought of it when I made the motion I would have embodied in my motion the amendment that is suggested, and therefore I ask to be allowed to incorporate the amendment in my motion.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Do you wish to embody it then, as I understand it, Delegate DeLeon, that it will be in the original motion?

DEL. DE LEON: Yes.

A DELEGATE: No objection.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: It is that this report be printed along with the financial report of the expert auditor as the report of the Secretary-Treasurer.

DEL. AUGUSTINE: I would be in favor of that motion as amended, but I think that waiting for that report will be the means of delaying the printing of the recommendations of the Secretary-Treasurer. I think we ought to have those first, so that the parts that are necessary to be turned over to the Constitution Committee can be turned over immediately. There would consequently be no delay for the Constitution Committee, and we would not prevent them from going on with their work. I do not think the financial report would have any bearing upon their constitutional work. It might, but I do not think so. If it has it could come up properly and be printed separately afterwards so as not to delay the Constitution Committee in its work. Now, I do not want to make an amendment to the amendment. I do not want to delay the action of this convention any longer, but I think that that ought to be recommended, that the two be printed separately.

DEL. RYAN: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a question at this time, if the detailed financial statement of the Secretary-Treasurer is the property of this body at this time?

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Not as yet.

DEL. RYAN: Well, I can not readily understand how you can have that in the printed report, how it can properly become a part of this motion at this time.

DEL. RICHTER: That is correct.

DEL. RYAN: Furthermore, I can very readily see that this motion can be so construed as to mean that this printed document should contain the complete financial report of the secretary-treasurer. I believe that provision should be made that nothing should be put in the printed report until it has been read here by Sec.-Treas. Trautmann, except that statement of the certified accountant who, as I understand, examined the books of the secretary a short time ago on the request of the Executive Board. That, of course, would very properly belong in the report, and I believe it can be found in a very short time in the general office. But, if the motion is to be so construed as to mean that the entire detailed report of the secretary will also be embodied in it, I think that is altogether an unnecessary proceeding.

DEL. DE LEON: Yes, the accountant's report.

DEL. HANNEMANN: A point of information. On the request of Sherman that he be permitted to report certain recommendations tomorrow morning, the report is to be printed. I suppose you remember that he made that request.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: That was the general understanding of the assemblage, I believe, that he would be allowed to bring that portion which he claimed he left by mistake when he came over today, and present it to the assemblage in the morning.

DEL. HANNEMANN: My point is that that is included in the printed report. I understand the reports are to be printed.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: I am of the opinion that it can be if Brother Sherman puts it with the other and the convention does not insist on hearing it read before it is printed.

DEL. HANNEMANN: That is what I would like to know at this time, so that we may have it understood.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Well, that is the opinion of the Chair, and I understood it was the consensus of opinion of the delegates that such would be the case. Now, Sec. Trautmann is here himself, and in regard to his financial report I would like him to answer the questions that have been asked by Del. McDonald and Del. Ryan, and others, as to the submitting of a financial statement of the organization.

DEL. McDONALD: Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the secretary read his financial statement and add it to his report if he has got it there.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: The financial statement is all printed and I can bring enough copies over tomorrow morning.

DEL. McDONALD: You can bring it up.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Yes, you can have copies of the financial statement here tomorrow morning, and then the auditor's report can be read. If it is the desire of the convention that that be the property of the house, then this expert accountant's report can be read, and tomorrow we will have enough copies printed here. The report of the Moyer and Haywood defense fund has been published in the "Industrial Worker." I do not know any other; that is the only account that has been given: the publication of the report of the receipts of that money in the "Industrial Worker" corresponding with the receipts we have given and the moneys that we have sent to Denver. There is only that account. But if it is not printed it can be printed at any time.

DEL. McDONALD: Well, Mr. Chairman, I take the position that we can not receive the report without the financial report. That was my position on the matter. I believe the Industrial Workers of the World have elected their secretary-treasurer and their assistant secretary-treasurer. I as one delegate on this floor want to know what the unions and departments have paid in financially. I want to hear an itemized statement read here from the secretary, and if this organization wishes to have an expert audit it, it will attend to that part of it or any other part that we want attended to. But I want to hear it from the secretary, the man that handled the finances for this organization.

DEL. KINNEALLY: Mr. Chairman and delegates, this document presented by our general secretary is a document that will go down in history. It is a document that is so long that very few of us can remember the important facts presented therein. So far as I can see there is nothing—

DEL. McDONALD: I rise to a point of order.

CHAIRMAN pro tem: State your point of order.

DEL. McDONALD: The point of order is this, that we are discussing whether or not the secretary-treasurer should add to his report the financial statement, not whether this document will go down in history or will not go down in history—that is not the question.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The Chair will rule the point is well taken.

DEL. KINNEALLY: The point is this: I can not see any connection whatsoever—I was coming to this point—to the necessity of having this document printed immediately and spread and placed in the hands, if possible, of every member of the Industrial Workers of the World, at least in the hands of every delegate in this convention. The financial statement has nothing whatsoever to do with the recommendations of the general secretary-treasurer. That can be distinctly and clearly a separate document. I hold that such is the case, and I am in favor of acting on the document presented today by the secretary.

Delegate Parks arose.

DEL. GOLDBERG: I have asked many times for the floor and did not get it.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: I was going to recognize Delegate Parks. He rose before, and I will recognize you next.

DEL. PARKS: Now, there seems to be some delay, there seems to be some confusion. There seems to be some lack of procedure in the fundamental ideas governing this organization, that is developing again. Over here one delegate (indicating McDonald) says that he won't listen to a report that has been prepared under the direction of the secretary-treasurer by an expert accountant. Over here (indicating Kinneally) we have another man that thinks it no part of the duty of the general secretary-treasurer to submit a financial report. In refutation of both of those errors I am going to rely on the constitution which I hold in my hand. First, the general secretary-treasurer "shall, with the approval of the General Executive Board, employ such assistance as is necessary to conduct the affairs of his office." Over here, the general secretary-treasurer "shall make a complete itemized report of the financial and other affairs of his office to each annual convention." It is there in black and white. That refutes the statement that has just been made, the statement that your president made regarding that point. Now, I would suggest that we want this printed. That is the question that is before the house. If we print the part of it that has already come before the house, that will not prevent us from printing the subsequent part of the secretary-treasurer's report when it does come before the house. Now, to expedite matters let us decide whether we are going to have it printed or not printed; that is the question.

DEL. GOLDBERG: Mr. Chairman, and fellow delegates, the secretary presented here a document covering a lot of questions in the former administration and recommending the delegates to refer them to the coming administration, etc. In his remarks he said that all the financial accounts were examined by an expert accountant and that any time he might be requested to produce that document from the expert accountant for inspection he is ready to do so. Then the only thing before the house is to adopt that document and then make a request on the secretary that he should procure that financial report, and there is nothing before the house, no motion to print the financial report in any way.

DEL. KEOGH: Mr. Chairman—

DEL. REID: I move the previous question. (Seconded.)

DEL. KEOGH: Mr. Chairman, I was on the floor when you recognized the previous question.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: I did not know that you were on the floor, Delegate Keogh, before the previous question was moved. I want



to state this to the delegates now, that when a delegate is standing and another one is talking I do not recognize him as having the floor. The previous question has been called for. You are now voting on the question, "Shall the previous question be put?"

DEL. MOTHERWELL: What is this, gag law we are going to have here?

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Perhaps they will decide what you are going to have. I am not deciding this question.

DEL. KEOGH: Then I might as well go back to New York.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The secretary will call the roll. Del. St. John, will you assist the secretary in calling the roll?

DEL. SIMS: Let us know the previous question. Let us know the motion we are voting on.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The previous question is that the two reports as read be printed for circulation amongst the delegates.

DEL. SMITH: If we vote for the previous question we vote for the publication of these reports?

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: No, it is to shut off debate. The question you are voting on is, "Shall the previous question be put?"

DEL. SMITH: All right.

The roll was then called. During the calling of the roll—

DEL. McDONALD: I want my name recorded as no.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Delegate McDonald asks that his vote be recorded as no.

DEL. McDONALD: Again, Mr. Chairman, I want you to record my name, McDonald, as no.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The secretary will make a note.

DEL. FRENCH: I want my name recorded no.

DEL. CRONIN: I am satisfied that the Musical organization shall have ten votes, but I am not willing that Bro. Shurtleff shall vote until such time as he is a member of this convention. I am willing that the organization shall have ten votes. If it has been delegated to Bro. Shurtleff I have no objection; otherwise I have.

DEL. McKINNON: I ask that Bro. Shurtleff be seated in accordance with that vote and announce it.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The correction will be made.

The vote was announced as follows: Total vote, 621; yes, 371; no, 250.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The motion is carried, and the secretary will proceed to call the roll on the previous question; that is the motion made by Del. DeLeon.

DEL. McMULLEN: I ask unanimous consent that this question be allowed to carry and this report be printed.

A DELEGATE: There is no objection.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Is there any delegate who is opposed to being recorded as voting in the affirmative on the motion to have the two reports printed for circulation amongst the delegates?

DEL. CRONIN: If we give consent is it the understanding that the financial statement of the general secretary-treasurer shall be embodied in that report? He has made a statement from month to month, and he has got that statement out. Do I understand that his financial statement will be printed and also the statement of the expert accountant? I want to understand it?

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The understanding that I have had of this matter was that the report of the expert accountant be printed

with this report, and that the matter of him submitting his financial report will be taken up separately.

DEL. CRONIN: That suits me.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Is that the thorough understanding?

DELEGATES: Yes.

DEL. McMULLEN: I do not so understand it. I understand this, that the report will be printed separately.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The secretary will proceed to call the roll on the previous question. The motion is that the two reports be printed.

DEL. McDONALD: I just want to ask one question before you put this motion. Have you any money in the treasury to pay for this report?

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The Chair is not in a position to give any rulings on that—

DEL. McDONALD: Well, can you give us any idea?

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: (Continuing)—or to listen to any argument.

DEL. McDONALD: Can you give us any idea how much it will cost to print this report?

A DELEGATE: Out of order.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The previous question was moved and carried. The vote is now on the printing of the two reports.

The roll was called by the secretary. During the calling of the roll—

DEL. KEOGH: I want to explain my vote. I want to say I am in favor of having these recommendations—I call them recommendations—printed, but I want to find out what is in the report of the financial secretary, and therefore I voted no.

The calling of the roll was then finished.

DEL. COX: I rise to a question of privilege.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The secretary will announce the corrected vote.

The vote resulted as follows: Total vote, 641; yes, 397; no, 244.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The motion is carried, and the secretary will have those reports printed.

DEL. COX: I want to offer the following resolution:

#### PAY OF DELEGATES.

"Whereas, A number of delegates to this convention having come from local unions that have only been able financially to furnish enough to barely pay expenses for about seven to ten days at the most; and

"Whereas, It is evident, judging from the experience of the past week, it will be a longer period; be it therefore

"Resolved, That each delegate not receiving a stipulated salary either from the general organization, the department or the local union to which he belongs, be allowed \$1.50 per day from the general treasury of the I. W. W. until the work of this convention is completed. This to take effect at once."

DEL. COX: I move the adoption of this resolution. (Motion seconded from all parts of the floor.)

DEL. McKINNON: I rise to a point of order. There is a Committee on Resolutions, and I think this resolution ought to be sent to the Committee on Resolutions.

DEL. COX: It is a privileged resolution.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: It has been regularly moved and supported that this resolution be adopted as read, by this convention.

DEL. McMULLEN: I rise to a point of order, that that is in direct violation of that section of the Constitution which says that each local or department shall pay the expense of its delegate. There is no provision for this body to levy an assessment or take the funds out of its treasury for that purpose.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The Chair will rule the point well taken, according to the Constitution.

DEL. TULLAR: I rise to a point of order.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: State your point of order.

DEL. TULLAR: My point of order is that this convention is the supreme authority of this organization, and if it should decide to enact that resolution we have the power.

ALTERNATE KIEFE: I want to ask the mover of the motion, does that mean that a delegate who is here and shall get a dollar and a half a day shall not act in opposition to the local that sends him here?

DEL. COX: That all delegates that do not receive compensation from a department or local union, that are not receiving a stipulated salary, shall receive a dollar and a half a day.

ALT. KIEFE: Does that include all delegates?

DEL. COX: No, not delegates that have gone home.

DEL. McKINNON: We have not had a ruling on McMullen's point of order.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: I ruled that the point was well taken, according to the Constitution.

DEL. LINGENFELTER: I appeal from the decision of the Chair.

DEL. McKINNON: There is no appeal at all when it is a violation of the Constitution.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The decision of the Chair has been appealed from.

DEL. LINGENFELTER: I desire to state my reasons for appealing.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: All right. Then I will state mine for my ruling.

DEL. LINGENFELTER: Mr. Chairman, and fellow delegates, this is certainly a serious situation. It is a well-known fact that the majority of the individuals that are here in this convention have come here thinking that they would meet men that had the interests of the working class at heart, and in view of that fact they believed that the longest possible time the convention could last would be ten days. We have found during the life of this convention the most shameful, disgusting and outrageous tactics to delay this convention as long as possible, due to the fact that these wage slave members came with only barely enough to last them for ten days, at about 80 cents a day. Now, it is true that our friends upon the opposite side of the house will try to raise constitutional objections—constitutional objections, because they know that in the face of this delay in this convention these men will have to go home or starve. I myself know what it is, for I am facing the same condition. I have heard those people shout "Sherman Bell" and other agencies of capitalism, and hurl it into our teeth, but let me tell you that Sherman Bell or no other capitalist agency ever employed more successful and contemptible means to starve out wage-slaves than these men have done in the last week. No more successful means could possibly be employed, and my reason for appealing against the decision of the chair is to bring this matter to a vote. I want to test the votes of the men who are drawing five dollars a day from the treasury of the Industrial Workers of the World and their expenses. I want to test the men who receive six dollars a day for going up the elevator one story

high to the next story for about two or three hours' work, sitting there on the Executive Committee and doing nothing. I want to test the men to find out whether we are to be driven home tonight—

DEL. McMULLEN: Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

DEL. LINGENFELTER (continuing)—or whether we are to stay here during the life of this convention. Delegates, stand like men and vote upon that appeal to bring the resolution to the front and show these men that we will stay here.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: If the delegates will permit, the Chair will state his position on his ruling. And I want to say that I am not making a ruling for the purpose of disfranchising any delegate on this floor from remaining here until this convention adjourns; neither am I making that ruling for the purpose of obstructing this convention, and if the delegate refers to me personally in his remarks, I contend that they are not justifiable. A ruling was demanded from the chair on a citation of the constitution. The chair ruled in conformity with that constitution, and while I was out of the chair as well as in the chair I have contended for that constitution till this convention amends it, and the ruling of the chair was in support of that provision of the constitution when the ruling was demanded from the chair. It is up to this convention to decide by your votes whether the ruling stands or does not stand. The motion or question on which you vote will be, "Shall the decision of the chair be sustained?" Those sustaining the chair will vote yes, and those sustaining the appeal will vote no. The secretary will proceed to call the roll.

After the calling of the roll—

ALT. KIEFE: My name was not called, and as my vote is very much needed to help the poor delegates who are from out of town and want to attend this convention, I want to go on record as voting no on sustaining the chair.

DEL. MARKLEY: I voted yes and I want to change it to no.

DEL. GINTHER: I voted yes and I want to change it to no.

DEL. VEAL: Mr. Chairman, it seems as though this constitution has been interpreted from a capitalist viewpoint all the year, and now the representatives of the working class have met here and there is going still to be that capitalist interpretation put on it, and—

A DELEGATE: A point of order.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: There is nothing before the house and nothing can come before the house till the vote is announced on the roll call.

DEL. VEAL: I want to ask a question. Is this body going to make any preparation for these men to remain here who have voted no, or won't it allow the sinews of war to remain in the hands of the enemy? That is what I want to know.

DEL. SMITH: I am sorry I can not vote these men \$1.50 a day. If I went home to New Orleans and told my members what I have seen here, if they would know that I had voted for giving these men money from the general treasury I would be severely reprimanded, and I believe the constituents of every delegate would treat them in the same way, if we had ourselves voted that we want these men to have their salary. They ought to be ashamed, and if they had any sense of honor they would be.

The vote was announced as follows: Yes, 386½; no, 251½.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The decision of the chair is sustained.

DEL. MARKLEY: I rise to make a motion that the convention in

committee of the whole go at once into consideration and change that part of the constitution that puts us on the street to starve.

DEL. SIMS: I second the motion.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: It is regularly moved and supported—do you say committee of the whole?

DEL. MARKLEY: Yes.

DELEGATES: No, the convention—

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: I do not understand your motion properly. Will you make it over?

DEL. MARKLEY: That the convention now take up the consideration of that clause of the constitution that puts us on the street to starve, and change it to suit the occasion.

ALT. KIEFE: I second it.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: It has been regularly moved and supported that the convention now take up that portion of the constitution that puts the delegates on the street to starve, and amend it. You have heard the motion as stated; are you ready for the question. (Question called for.)

DEL. CRONIN: I desire a point on information.

DEL. PARKS: Unanimous consent.

DEL. CRONIN: Is there anything in the constitution that puts us on the street to starve? Are you going to take up something that is not in the constitution?

DEL. PARKS: That is the effect of the constitution.

DEL. MARKLEY: I wish to speak in support of my motion.

DEL. HANNEMANN: Mr. Chairman—

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: This delegate has the floor. The mover of the motion has the floor.

DEL. MARKLEY: I give it up.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Then this delegate over here has the floor.

DEL. DUNCAN: I will read this part of the constitution referred to. The constitution reads as follows: "The expense of delegates attending the convention shall be borne by the respective organizations." You notice the wording of that, and incidentally, if you consider it carefully, you may understand why I voted against the ruling of Bro. Sherman. "Expense of delegates"; that does not say anything about their wages. This proposition is not a proposition as regards the expense of the delegates, either on the railroad or in the hotels here in the city. It is purely a wage proposition, and that is not covered by the constitution. However, as the house has sustained you in that ruling, which is manifestly wrong, I am for this motion that is before the house now.

DEL. RICHTER: A question on information.

DEL. DE LEON: Mr. Chairman—

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The brother rose for a question of information. If the delegate who has the floor will give way for you to ask the question, all right, but if you are going to make a speech Del. DeLeon has the floor.

DEL. RICHTER: I am not going to make a speech. I only want to ask the chair upon what paragraph of the constitution he based his ruling.

THE CHAIRMAN: Del. DeLeon.

DEL. DE LEON: I rise to make an amendment to the motion. I endorse the ruling of the chair. The chair's ruling was correct, because that clause of the constitution could be interpreted only in the sense he did. Consequently the motion that Del. Cox made implies a change

in the constitution by a specific amendment which does not specifically move a change of the constitution, and the chair was right in his ruling. I move to amend, because of the way in which my angry colleague (Del Markley) put his motion; I move to amend his motion to read: "That the clause of the constitution which is found in Article VI, page 18, and which reads, 'The expense of delegates attending the convention shall be borne by their respective organizations,' that is the clause—that that clause be suspended." That is my amendment. (Amendment seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: There has been an amendment offered to the motion that the clause in question be suspended.

DEL. McMULLEN: I rise to a point of order.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: State your point of order.

DEL. McMULLEN: My point of order is that it does not lie in this convention to suspend any single word or line in that constitution only by the process laid down therein, of adopting something in this convention and submitting it to a referendum of the entire organization for ratification.

DEL. DE LEON: I was coming to that.

DEL. McMULLEN: And that you can not suspend it, any part of it, and you can only amend it in that form.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The chair is not going to rule on this point of order. The delegates on the floor of this convention are going to pass a ruling by their vote, whether they are going to suspend that section of the constitution or not.

DEL. MARKLEY: I withdraw my motion, with the consent of my second, and let the amendment go before the house, in order to expedite business.

DEL. RYAN: I would like to ask the delegate a question, through the chair. I would like to ask Del. McMullen to refer me to that particular portion of the constitution which provides that it can only be amended by a referendum vote of the membership. That is the point that you have raised on this floor, that any action on the part of this convention at this time would not be legal except it were ratified by a referendum vote of the membership. I would ask you at this time to refer me to that portion of the constitution which requires a referendum vote of the members to enact a constitution into law.

DELEGATES: Show it.

DEL. McMULLEN: What is the question, Bro. Ryan?

DEL. RYAN: I was asking you to show me that part of the constitution which requires that amendments shall be submitted to a referendum vote of the membership before they become law.

DEL. McMULLEN: Do you ask me to show you that?

DEL. RYAN: Yes.

DEL. McMULLEN: The entire proposition is based on the right to ratify, for one thing.

DEL. RYAN: I hardly think that is a satisfactory reply, Mr. Chairman.

DEL. McMULLEN: Let them take the constitution and read it. The gentleman can get it.

DEL. PARKS: I rise to a point of order now.

DEL. RYAN: I want to ask who has the floor, I or Del. Parks.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: I think if you could segregate and hold a convention one at a time, that you could agree possibly on all points. You have the floor, Bro. Ryan.

DEL. RYAN: It has been frequently stated on the floor that we are governed by this constitution, but if my memory serves me right, Del.

McMullen stated that it was submitted to a referendum vote of the membership of the Industrial Workers of the World. I contend that such was not the case. When it was formulated here at the first annual convention of the Industrial Workers of the World and adopted by the convention then assembled, it then and there became the law and has been the law to the present time, and if such is the case I can see no reason in God's world why we cannot turn around right here and now and amend that constitution so as to suit our needs, without referring it to a referendum vote of the membership.

DEL. McKINNON: It is absolutely wrong to alter this constitution for a specific purpose, and I give warning that I am prepared to serve a court injunction upon the Secretary-Treasurer not to pay out any money for that purpose.

(Derisive cries, and cries of "Get out an injunction.")

DEL. RYAN: Where will you get it? From a capitalist court?

(Great confusion, cries of "Injunction," and hisses.)

DEL. SIMS: Let us vote.

DEL. PARKS: I rise to a point of order.

(Cries of "Sit down.")

DEL. PARKS: I will not sit down. I rise to a point of order.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: State your point of order.

A DELEGATE: I move the previous question.

DEL. PARKS: I rise to a point of order, and you will listen to it.

ALT. KLEFE: I want to make a motion—

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: You are out of order. Del. Parks has the floor.

DEL. PARKS: Now, Mr. Chairman, Bro. McMullen, of Butte, Mont., has raised a point of order that the proposed suspension of a clause of the constitution or amendment would be out of order, and he alleged that there was a specific clause in the constitution, the fundamental organic law of this organization, that would sustain him. Now, I make the point of order that a man who alleges the existence of a written law is bound to bring in that law and lay it before the house that is to decide that point of law alleged to exist. (Cries of "That is right.") He fails to bring it when we demand it of him, therefore it is presumed, it is safe to say it does not exist, and I maintain that if he does not produce the written law that he says does exist, his point of order is not well taken. I ask for a ruling on that point of order.

A DELEGATE: The previous question has been moved.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The Chair is not ruling on that point of order.

A DELEGATE: Previous question called for.

DEL. DE LEON: The previous question has been moved.

DEL. SIMS: I want to say this, that this is a question properly—

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: It is regularly moved and supported that the previous question be put.

DEL. SIMS: The Chair has recognized me, and I want the floor.

A DELEGATE: The previous question has been moved.

DEL. SIMS: If he recognized this delegate, why not me? Now, I want to say—

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The question and the vote now recurs on the question, "Shall the previous question be put?" The Secretary will call the roll. Those voting to have the previous question immediately put will vote yes. Those voting to leave it open for discussion will vote no.

(The roll was then called.)

DEL. FITZGERALD: I am entitled to another vote from San Antonio, and this committee has not seen fit to turn it in, and I asked them and they say that the credentials are before this committee, and they told me before that as soon as I was qualified in the Transportation Department that No. 185 would be recorded as one vote for me. I would like to know about that.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: We will take that up later, Del. Fitzgerald.

The vote was announced as follows: Total vote, 631½; yes, 380½; no, 251.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The motion is carried. According to your vote the present constitution is suspended—that section.

A DELEGATE: Oh, no; the previous question.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: That is right; excuse me. It was the previous question that you were voting on. The vote now will occur on the motion to suspend the section of the constitution.

DEL. DE LEON: Unanimous.

DEL. McKINNON: No.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The Secretary will proceed to call the roll.

A DELEGATE: What is the motion?

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The motion is to suspend the article of the constitution at this time that pertains to the expense of delegates while attending convention being borne by their respective organizations. The motion is to suspend that portion of the constitution. Those in favor of suspending that will vote yes. Those opposed to suspending it will vote no. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was then called.

The vote was announced as follows: Total vote, 633½; yes, 375; no, 258½.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The motion to suspend that section, that portion of the constitution, is carried, and by your vote you have so suspended it.

ALT. KIEFE: I rise to make a motion. My motion is this: Del. McKinnon stated that he was going to get an injunction against this organization paying out any money to the delegates, which you know; I don't know what the amount will be, only he says he is going to get an injunction if any money is paid out to any delegate. For this reason has this delegate a right to sit in a convention of the working class—a man who goes to a capitalist judge and tries to get an injunction against the working class who are present at this convention? I rise to make a motion that this delegate, McKinnon, be expelled from the Industrial Workers of the World. (Seconded, amid applause.)

DEL. LINGENFELTER: Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. (A voice, "Sit down!") Oh, no, I won't.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: There is a point of order. Concede the same right to another delegate that you want for yourselves, and let the delegate state his point of order.

DEL. LINGENFELTER: My point of order is that the local unions which I represent and which all other delegates represent have the entire power.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: It has been regularly moved and supported that Del. McKinnon be expelled from the Industrial Workers of the World.

DEL. FORBERG: I rise to a point of order. The local unions of the



Industrial Workers of the World have entire jurisdiction over their members.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: You rise to a point of order, you say?

DEL. FORBERG: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The chair will rule that the point is well taken and the motion is out of order.

DEL. COX: I renew the motion I introduced a while ago, which you declared out of order, on this constitutional clause. This constitutional clause being set aside, I reintroduce the resolution. Do you want to hear it read again?

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: I don't. You can make your motion.

DEL. COX: My motion is that these delegates without a stipulated salary from organizations or departments of local unions that they belong to, be allowed \$1.50 a day from the general treasury until the work of this convention is concluded; this to take effect immediately.

DEL. TULLAR: I move its adoption. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: It has been regularly moved and supported that the resolution be adopted as read and that the delegates shall receive \$1.50 a day from the treasury of the general organization until the adjournment of this convention. You have heard the motion as stated; are you ready for the question? (Question called for.) The secretary will call the roll.

A DELEGATE: I ask for a unanimous vote.

DEL. COX: I would like to make a little explanation in connection with that before you put the motion, and that is this: It is understood by the committee that drew up this resolution that those who did not need this would not ask for it. Please be fair enough and square enough not to ask for it.

DEL. KEOGH: Mr. Chairman, I am against the resolution as it has been presented. This is practically the first convention, while we had another one, of the Industrial Workers of the World. You will have coming before you perhaps at the next convention, the largest you have had,—they will be all coming for this, and the same conditions must prevail then because they will have a majority and will outvote you. I would suggest to the ones that are here who have a surplus, let them turn it over or give their little mites of money and assist the ones that have not got it, and there will be no trouble in this convention. But if you find any cause or pretext, if we have to go to work and support the delegates out of our general fund, what will the individual members say when we go back to our locals?

A DELEGATE: They will say you did the right thing.

DEL. KEOGH: You might think so, but they will want to know before they send their delegates to another convention, if they are paying in their money to organize the working class. That is the question that will be asked, and you cannot and there is not a man in this convention that can refute the statement that that is the question that will be asked by the members of the local unions when you go back. Is it for a junketing tour that this money is collected, or for the working class, that we might emancipate the working people of this country? That is the condition that you will have to face when you go home. I, as one delegate, am willing to pay my little mite in to assist those that have not got it at present.

DEL. SIMS: Mr. Chairman, and Fellow Delegates; this resolution as submitted is submitted from a standpoint of principle and the fact that this resolution will be made known to the rank and file and all those who have declared assent to the class struggle. I readily coincide

with it, but those delegates who are here with a big wage in their pockets, to the extent of \$10.00, \$20.00 or \$50.00, as I have seen in the pockets of some of the delegates—and most especially the delegates that have had the audacity to introduce talk of an injunction against the wage workers, and when we come at them they get up and howl out a capitalist expression that they will serve an injunction against our class. I am absolutely sore against it, and if a man will do a thing of that kind he is not a true expression and reflection of the class he stands for. He says the wage working class are here to make laws for propaganda to build up the organization. A man that will make such an assertion as that certainly should be working, and later I am going to make a motion—

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: I rule that if you are going to speak you will have to speak to the motion before the house.

DEL. SIMS: I am speaking on the motion.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: If you are going to abuse Del. McKinnon or any other delegate you will have to do it at some other time. While you are discussing a motion I want to be fair with you and I want to be fair with everybody else.

DEL. SIMS: In conclusion I want to make an amendment to that resolution also—I don't know whether it is necessary I should, and I guess I will not. But I am absolutely and heartily in favor of carrying this resolution through, because it appeals to each and every wage slave who is sent here and is going to fight to bring about a better condition for his class. Everyone knows the condition this convention has been put to by such dilatory tactics as we have seen. This is a serious proposition, and I hope that every delegate will stand in support of it.

DEL. HOLMES: This is the first time I have been on this floor, as I don't believe in boring people to death. But this is an occasion when I think everybody should speak, and I wish to say that I consider it an absolute outrage for anybody to vote against such a motion. Now, people come here to this convention, and the membership who sent them want a full and free expression. The people who are not able to support themselves here are mostly the representatives of mixed locals, who, if they had not spent money in propaganda and spread it all over the country, would not be in the position that they are in today. I would like to ask how you can get a full expression if people are denied the right to stay here because they have not got the means to do so? We would then have an expression of a few men who had sufficient money to stay. For my part, I do not want it, but there are other brothers who do, and I maintain it should be the unanimous vote of the delegates in order to get a full expression of the Industrial Workers of the World, that they should be only too glad to pay the money to their brother wage slaves, so as to get a full and free and a class conscious expression for the working class movement.

DEL. DUNCAN: Bro. Keogh has said he is opposed to voting this wage to the delegates who are not here, for the reason that the money in our treasury ought to be spent in organizing the working class. I want to ask the brothers and sisters here if this is not organizing the working class, and if it is not the most essential part of organizing the working class, what is it? We have got to have this work done here as the first preliminary step, or the work that the Industrial Workers' organizers do the next year will be superfluous and worthless, for there will be no call for it, if we do not complete the work we are sent here to do, and we can complete it, I submit to you, in no other

way. The local unions that we represent are represented by a large portion of the delegates here who will be covered by this provision because their work is paid for under no other circumstances. The proposition as it was originally put here was not a charity proposition. It is not a demand for assistance or for expenses or for anything of the kind. It is a demand for a wage, and I submit to you that there is a vast difference between expense and wages. The motion as it originally came up was thoroughly constitutional and thoroughly in order, and even if this provision in the constitution had not been suspended we would have committed no crime in making such provision as this, and I think that it is at least a point against the brothers. The brothers are at least making one point against this when they get up here and take the floor, while it is known and understood that they are getting a wage of \$5.00 a day for their presence here and oppose paying a wage of \$1.50 a day to their brothers on the floor beside them. The proposition that this motion demands is merely a proposition of simple justice. We are not asking favors from the Tammany Hall politicians or any other satellites of capitalism. All we want is a living wage, a very low wage. Our demand is a modest one, and I believe we will get it.

DEL. RYAN: I am a delegate from the Department of Mining Industry, and as such my transportation is paid from Jerome, Arizona, to Chicago and back again. Not only that, but I get \$5.00 a day from the date that I leave until I get back there, mind you; not for the number of days that this convention is in session, but for every day that expires, as I understand it. Am I correct, Bro. Chairman?

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: You are correct.

DEL. RYAN: From the time I leave until I get back again, even when I am sitting on the train doing nothing but read a newspaper, I get \$5.00 a day, and I get it from the working class. I find delegates on this floor who are getting no pay whatsoever, and I cannot conceive for the life of me how any man can complain of paying them. It is a humiliating proposition for those men to ask for that to which they are entitled. I cannot for the life of me understand how any delegate on this floor, after all those expressions and doings, can refuse the representatives of the working class the assistance they demand and need. I for one want a vote and expression that will be cast broadcast all over the land. I want to say to you further, that it is no trouble for any man to talk and espouse any theory whatever, when he gets his transportation and \$5.00 a day for doing it. We find lots of men who have prostituted themselves for far less than that; but when we find comrades—this is the first time I have used that term on this floor—when we find comrades and fellow workers who will dig down into their jeans with the meager pittance that they are getting and come to this convention to work not for themselves, but for the interests of their class, and knowing that they have got no personal ambition to serve and have no money in their pockets, I as a five-dollar-a-day delegate, say that I take my hat off to them.

DEL. SMITH: Mr. Chairman and Fellow Delegates: I am glad to have an opportunity to vote for this proposition whereby these representatives of the working class will be in a better position to stay here and fight that battle that I see, since I am here, is very much in need of being fought. Mr. Chairman, were I to vote against this proposition and go back to New Orleans, I tell you, just as sure as I am standing here, I would be expelled from that organization with very little ceremony, and I would deserve to be. I am glad that an opportunity to

vote upon this proposition has come, for it determines positively and absolutely—it determines beyond the very shadow of a doubt who are the representatives of the working class and who are here for the welfare of the labor fakirs and who are devoted to the welfare of the working class. That is all I wish to say.

DEL. ROGERS: Mr. Chairman, this is the first time I have been on the floor of this convention. I did not come here to make a speech or to immortalize myself as an orator; but the brother has mentioned what would the southern delegates or southern locals think of that action? I want to say that so far as Lake Charles, La., is concerned, the members of Local Lake Charles know we have got to abide by the law of the survival of the fittest. They know that it is absolutely impossible for any man to lay down a law that will meet all conditions. We are confronted by a fact here. This is not the first time in the movement of the proletarians, nor will it be the last, when we will have to form snap judgments as to whether we are to meet the occasion like men. I tell you, so far as a man in this audience being ashamed of not having a dollar in his pocket, if you look at the pictures that adorn the walls of the house of every American that loves to look up, you will see Valley Forge placed there commemorating the heroes who fought the battle from Bunker Hill to Yorktown in rags. And those men who are in this audience today need not be ashamed because they rightfully appeal to the treasury of the proletarian class. It only bespeaks a man who is ashamed because he has been robbed of the last farthing in his pocket by a capitalist; because he is ashamed of that. It only bespeaks that he has not altogether had all the vitality crushed out of him by capitalism; that alone should make him proud. That is the sentiment there. Without sentiment we know we have got to abide by the law of the survival of the fittest. I thank you for your attention.

DEL. PARKS: Where does the \$5.00 a day come from that the members of the Mining Department and other departments get? It comes from the working class within their organization. It comes in the shape of dues and fees. What does the department pay to support the general treasury? Eight and one-third cents per member per month. For the members that joined the organization within their department the initiation fee goes to the department and not to the general treasury; the charter fee also.

DEL. GOLDBERG: I rise to a point of order, that Bro. Parks does not speak to the question at all.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The point of order is well taken.

DEL. PARKS: All right; I am arguing from the point of finances. I will proceed.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Discuss the subject matter before the house in the form of a motion.

DEL PARKS: All right. When a local under the Industrial Workers of the World is chartered we pay \$10.00 into the general treasury. When I pay my dues 25 cents per month goes into the general treasury. I represent a local union of about 350 paid-up members, and the same is true with the rank and file of these individual delegates here representing the local unions. Fifty per cent of all the tax we pay into the local that way goes to support the general treasury. And that is nothing more than just and right. So to have this paid out of the treasury now, I maintain that it is sending it back to the local unions.

DEL. McMULLEN: Mr. President and delegates, I believe that everyone that has spoken has favored this. I want to say that I op-

pose it. I want to say that I am actuated by what seems to me good reasons. I do not believe that this body ought to take an action that by doing it will drive out of its ranks the entire Montana State organization. (Derisive laughter.) I have got no exception to the proposition at all. I don't believe that one single local of the Western Federation of Miners in Montana or the I. W. W. will stand for this act. I want to say, Mr. President—

DEL. RYAN: A point of order.

DEL. McMULLEN: That every single delegate that came here— (Confusion, and the Chairman rapped for order.)

DEL. RYAN: I would like to ask by what right Del. McMullen on this floor claims to represent the unions of Montana.

DEL. McMULLEN: By right of the same party that elected me and did not elect you as a delegate. You were elected as a substitute, sir. You and I ran for election but I was elected and you were not. That is exactly the reason.

DEL. RYAN: I have got the same right on this floor as Delegate McMullen.

DEL. McMULLEN: Yes.

DEL. RYAN: I ask by what right you claim to represent specifically the people of Montana.

DEL. McMULLEN: I come here representing the Western Federation of Miners. Did he rise to a point of order, or rise to a question?

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: He rose to a point of order. His point of order was by what right you come here to represent Montana.

DEL. McMULLEN: That was the question, yes.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The chair will rule the point of order well taken; that you did not come here to represent Montana in this convention.

DEL. McMULLEN: I have no hesitation in saying that those people that I do represent pay the largest part of the per capita tax of this general organization, and I, just like the balance of the delegates that sit upon this floor, express the feelings of the men who in their general surroundings assist them in forming their convictions. That cannot be denied; they can see it here on all hands. Now the simple sum of \$1.50 a day is ridiculous, from my standpoint, to sustain anyone upon. If a man does an honest day's work anywhere in the world he does it on the floor of this convention. It is by no means an easy task; and I, if I were voting a salary to members, I would never get down to a \$9.00 a week level on that proposition. Now, I know the effect of charges of this kind of what would be termed salary grabbing. I know the effect, on the other hand, of being met and asked this question, "Did that convention suspend the constitution, or one section?" And I will have to say they did. And then, if they can suspend one section and stick their hands in the treasury and pay \$1.50 a day to those who were needing it, what is there to prevent them from suspending any other part of the constitution from one cover to another? Nothing. If this can be done in this manner, perhaps everything in it can be suspended; it has no force and no effect. Practically that is a real and true statement; it is of no force and no effect. Now then, again, I represent 103 votes here. By the same power that you gentlemen are suspending this you can suspend that and give me one vote alone. You can do the same thing; you have got the right. But I would say this, my brothers: it would be far more preferable and you could do more for the organization if you had suspended some section without a salary that when he started out. I want to say that the first convention of this

grab. Now this is the point I want to make particularly. Every delegate that came here knew that there was a section in the law of our organization prior to this act that stipulated that his local should pay his expenses. It did not define any particular one of them. He knew organization, and Del. Ryan from the Western Federation of Miners, the Department of Mining, was of it—I want to say that they created that particular section. I want to say further that I have it on the statement of Charles Moyer himself that there were men sitting in that convention so actuated by their desire to assist their fellow men that they did not have enough to pay for their bed and meals—similar to the brothers of some who are here. And in the face of that condition they placed that identical law in the constitution, knowing this, that when they went out and asked a man to come into the I. W. W. and attend its convention they were to be asked this: “Are these annual conventions junketing tours for us to pay the money and you people to meet and expend it?” Now, in saying that I do not cast any reflections upon the motives of anyone, but I am thinking of the future of the organization. I don’t care for the \$50.00 or \$75.00 a day that you are going to expend in this way. That is nothing, but you destroy this organization, its desires, its basis, and that is my honest and sincere sentiment. I believe what I say on this is true, and I shall vote that sentiment.

DEL. TULLAR: I call for the previous question.

Del. Hannemann endeavored to secure the floor, in the midst of much confusion.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: I would request of the delegates again that they concede the same rights to the other delegates as they want themselves, and if those against the discussion of this matter intelligently are not ready to vote and are going to continue the general turmoil, we might as well adjourn. It will be either one or the other. Del. Hannemann has the floor.

DEL. HANNEMANN: Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to taking this action. I know that we all belong to the great working class. I know that on the face of it it would seem unjustifiable for a member of the working class to vote against such a motion. But let us look into the matter. It is a matter of principle, after all. We are looking out for the future interests as well as the present of the Industrial Workers of the World. Now we have already established a dangerous precedent in suspending a clause of this constitution, and now we are only heaping coals upon the fire. Now, we want to know if this thing is going to be thrown right back upon us. I certainly think those making this motion make it with the best intentions. We also know that it may turn out to be with the worst intentions, and if they carry on work on this constitution which will be detrimental to it in the future, then what will you have to say? I say it is a matter of principle. We have a constitution, and we should stand by it until the time when we have by proper means changed it. We have already provided for these delegates who perhaps cannot afford to stay here any longer. We have provided for them; they can simply write back or telegraph back to their organizations saying that they cannot stay any longer, and to elect another man who is present at this convention, or rather to elect an alternate who is present at this convention to act in his behalf. That would be proper means to take. I claim that is the proper manner and method to pursue, and not to act as we have acted, in an unconstitutional manner and establish a dangerous precedent and take money out of our treasury. I am opposed to doing it. As I say, we concede on

the face of it, that it would be wrong for me to do it. But looking into the matter in the double light of knowledge and experience and as a member of the working class who understands the conditions of the working class, I claim that I have been correct and true; I have not on this floor yet cast any slurs upon those who are slurring others all the time, and I as one say those who used these terms are judging others by themselves, and the time is coming when they will have to realize it, when their brains will be clearer than they are today. I know the minds of the working class. I know the reasons for their actions. I know their brains are fagged and they cannot help themselves.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: I will have to declare this out of order.

DEL. HANNEMANN: Therefore I hold that I will have to vote against this motion.

DEL. GOLDBERG: I want to ask Bro. Hannemann, if I leave Chicago, will you represent my vote here or not?

DEL. HANNEMANN: If I am instructed by my local I will have to do it.

DEL. GOLDBERG: But I would not trust you with my vote.

DEL. BROWN: Mr. President, I am a delegate representing Local 77, Goldfield, Nevada, and also representing three other locals in the state of Nevada, and if either one of those four locals would ever find out that I voted against this proposition they would be laying for me with a No. 44 or a rope ready to hang me.

DEL. TULLAR: I move the previous question.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The previous question has been called for.

DEL. COX: I want to close. I have a right to close this debate. I only want a minute; that is all I want. I want to refer to the remark made over here about setting a precedent, about setting aside a constitutional clause, the danger of it, etc. I want simply to say that I am here instructed by my local to introduce a constitutional amendment not only to set aside this clause, but to insert a clause that we will at the next convention have proportional representation; and without casting any reflection on these four delegates from the Western Federation of Miners, that at the next convention no man will be here with 109 votes in his pocket.

DEL. FORBERG: I want to make just two points, that is all. I have not asked the floor before, but I see a good chance to make two points on this proposition, I think, and the first is this: The delegates on this floor must be a reflection of one of two sentiments. They must either reflect the economics and the rules of the capitalist class or they must reflect those of the working class. My brother over there from Montana, Bro. McMullen, brought out the point that we had set a precedent here, that we had set aside the constitution. In that very statement he reflected the capitalist class. When it is to their interest to say that we must abide by the constitution, they call the attention of the working class to the fact that we must abide by the constitution. But when it is to their interest to set aside the constitution they tell us the things we do are unconstitutional. My brother back here again brought forward the same idea, and in bringing forward that idea I claim that those men and the sentiment they represent—not being personal at all—are a direct reflection of capitalist economics, and that we as a working class economic organization have no right to reflect anything on this floor save working class economics. We are here to organize or to help build up the organization already

made, in the economic working class organization, and whatever we as representatives of the working class decide is in the interest of that class, we are justified in doing. And I want to state right here that if Bro. McMullen thinks that when he goes back home his organization will support him, he is mistaken. Mind you, I don't believe they will; not that I don't believe he believes that is true; I believe he does believe it; but I don't believe it is true. I don't believe in any sense of the word that the Western Federation of Miners stand for that sort of economics. In fact, I am very clearly convinced that they do not stand for it, because the majority of the representatives of the Western Federation of Miners and the majority of the men from that organization on this floor are a reflection of the working class economics, with a clear understanding of the position that we are in here. I say that if these members who have been sent here by our local unions to represent the working class fail to vote in the interest of those local unions, I tell them in so many words that when they go back again to them they will never again, I believe, be elected to represent their interests.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The previous question has been called for. Are there any objections? If not, the vote will result on the motion.

The roll was then called.

DEL. HESLEWOOD: The brother here stated that he was going to serve an injunction against the payment of this money. I would like to ask what time he is going to serve the injunction at the office, so that we can be around there and do a little revolutionary work.

ALT. KIEFE: Mr. Chairman—

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: I am not going to recognize anybody as having the floor until this vote is announced.

ALT. KIEFE: I want a point of information. It has nothing to do with the voting at all.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: You can get that after the vote is announced.

The vote was announced as follows: Total vote, 616; yes, 378½; no, 237½.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The motion is carried.

DEL. DE LEON: I ask the floor on a matter of high privilege. I want to ask Del. McKinnon whether he is ready to retract his statement about getting out an injunction against this body. Is he ready to retract?

DEL. McKINNON: Yes, I am ready to retract. I must admit that I was not altogether mad, but that I was between mad and halfway mad when I said that.

DEL. De LEON: All right.

DEL. McKINNON: And anybody who knows anything about me in New York knows that I have nothing in common with the capitalist class. In the last six months I can prove that by being a member of the I. W. W. and being instrumental in organizing it I have been fired from a position that I have held five or six years by the president of the Building Employers' Association, and been subjected to annoyance by the American Federation of Labor. As to the delegate who said I had \$500, that is my money, my local not paying me one red cent for being here, and I am here practically at my own expense. Furthermore, our organization in New York, as Bro. Augustine will agree, has been fired from hall to hall, and when we do get one we



are put to enormous expense, because the American Federation is against us. Now, if there is any apology due to the organization, I give it. I did not mean it at first.

PRESIDENT SHERMAN: The brothers have passed something here now that bears upon Brother Trautmann and myself, and all I have got to say is this, that I believe it absolutely necessary, to bring things in order and that it can be paid over rapidly, that Bro. Trautmann and myself meet them all at the office and see who are to get it. Our funds are in the bank. It must be drawn by check, and I was going to make this proposition, simply in order not to be in a turmoil, that the brothers who expect to come in under this clause would give their names to the secretary, that we would have their names, so that we may know who this money is going to, so that we can draw the checks. That is the only thing I wanted. We wish to have the names, and then the secretary can depend on how much money is needed and draw it out. He does not carry any money in the office, unless it happens to be a five-dollar bill that comes in the mail. Otherwise he has to get it out of the bank, and I am making this statement simply for Bro. Trautmann and myself to facilitate matters so we can pay rapidly and be back here at the convention in the morning.

#### MINUTES OF G. E. B.

DEL. DE LEON: I move you, as a special order of business tomorrow morning, that immediately after the reading of the minutes of the convention the minutes of the G. E. B. be read to this convention, so that we shall have a complete report of our national officers. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: It has been regularly moved and supported that immediately after the minutes—

DEL. De LEON: That it be made the special order of business.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: That immediately after the reading of the minutes the report of the Executive Board be read and made a special order of business at that time. You have heard the motion as stated; are you ready for the question? (Question called for.)

DELEGATES: No objection. Unanimous.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: If there is no delegate on the floor who objects to be recorded in the affirmative on this motion it will be carried. Hearing no objection, it is so ordered.

#### RESOLUTIONS.

DEL. RYAN: I would like to state that the Committee on Resolutions met for the first time last night immediately after adjournment. We had a large mass of documents that were handed in by various delegates. The committee labored under the impression that every resolution should be turned in to the Committee on Resolutions. We finally explained to those whom we met in the convention hall that the proper mode of procedure, as we understood it, was to leave them with the secretary and have them read and then referred by the presiding officer to the proper committee. There are fifteen, twenty, possibly twenty-five of those resolutions lying on the secretary's desk, and in view of the fact that the Committee on Resolutions, of which I am a member, may have a good deal of work to do, it was my intention to move that it be made the first order of business tomorrow, but in view of the fact that Del. De Leon has already introduced a motion providing for the first order of business, I would like to ask, without a motion, that

the chair would be good enough to take up the matter immediately after disposing of the minutes of the Executive Board, so that our committee as well as the others can get those documents into their hands and act on them and get them back before the convention.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: If there is no objection it will be so understood.

On motion, adjourned until 9 o'clock, Tuesday, September 25.

#### TUESDAY, SEPT. 25.—MORNING SESSION.

President Sherman called the convention to order at 9.00 A. m. Del. Mahoney was called to the chair.

The Secretary called the roll of members.

#### CREDENTIALS AND VACANCIES.

DEL. FOX. I wish to state that both of my colleagues from Cincinnati have gone home, and as we hold a collective credential I will ask that their credentials be added to mine.

THE SECRETARY: The delegates have left a communication to that effect.

DEL. FOX: Suppose it be changed now, so that when it comes to vote I can have it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Your local unions elected each of you?

DEL. FOX: Yes, collectively in mass meeting. The Credentials Committee have certified that.

THE CHAIRMAN: It was decided in a similar case yesterday that when the locals have elected jointly and one of the delegates has gone home, both of the votes would be given to the other.

DEL. FOX: This is the same case.

THE CHAIRMAN: If there is no objection the request of the delegate will be granted, so long as they were elected jointly, all representing the same body of men who elected them.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Making the vote four.

DEL. FOX: Yes, Eisenberg and Dial, one vote each.

PRES. SHERMAN: I have a communication here that was handed to me through these delegates that left the convention the other day, dated—

Chicago, Sept. 24, 1906. Local Union 309, Printers and Bookbinders of the I. W. W., desire Del. Fred Moore reinstated at the second annual convention of the I. W. W. (Signed) I. BARR, Secretary.

With the seal of the union thereon. I move that that request be complied with. (Seconded.)

DEL. FOX: If there is no objection, let him be reinstated.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: It has been regularly moved and supported that the request be complied with. If there is no delegate on the floor who is opposed to being recorded as voting in the affirmative on this question it will be so recorded as carried. Hearing none it is so ordered.

#### SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT OF PRESIDENT.

PRES. SHERMAN: I beg to offer what I term a supplement to the President's report, in the way of recommendations of changes to be made in our present constitution:

Add to "Duties of the general secretary-treasurer," to be inserted in the constitution after the second line on page 10, "he shall keep a complete record of the name of each member and date of initiation in a register, alphabetically arranged.

He shall issue a membership book to each member belonging to local unions holding charters issued directly from the General Administration and shall under no circumstances supply members or local unions with blank membership books."

I further recommend that the following be inserted after the last line of instructions on page 10: "Being an executive officer of the Industrial Workers of the World, he shall refrain from participating in any local work, unless such pertains to his duties as General Secretary-Treasurer."

Change Section 2, Article 3, to read "25c per male member per month and 15c per female member per month."

Change Section 4 to read "initiation fees for members of local unions, as provided for in Article 1, Section 2, and Section 3, shall not be less than \$1.00. Monthly dues shall not be less than 50c."

Change third paragraph on page 14 to read: "All international industrial department unions subordinate to the Industrial Workers of the World, shall charge for their initiation fee in their respective unions not less than \$1.00."

Change fourth paragraph on page 14 to read: "25c per male member and 15c per female member."

Change Section 2, Article 4, to read: "5c of the 25c per male member per month and 5c of the 15c per female member per month, received from local unions paying directly to headquarters, will be placed into the Defense Fund, the balance to be placed into the General Fund."

Change Section 4, Article 7, to read: "Whenever there are twenty-five, or more, local unions with no less than 10,000 members in any one industry, the General Executive Board will have power to proceed to call a convention of that industry and organize them as an industrial department of the Industrial Workers of the World."

I recommend the following changes for by-laws:

Add to "Instructions to financial secretary," beginning after the 4th word in the last line on page 22 of the constitution, "At the close of each meeting he shall make out a list of the newly initiated members on Form —, and the same shall be mailed immediately to the General Secretary-Treasurer, with a remittance of 5c for each membership book. On receipt of such membership books from the General Secretary-Treasurer, the financial secretary of each local union shall deliver such membership books to the newly initiated members at the next meeting of the union. He shall, at the close of the last meeting of each month, prepare his monthly report, in which he will give the names of all members suspended, withdrawn, or in any way becoming not in good standing with his local union. This report shall be read at the first meeting of the following month to his local union and when approved by the local union the same must be sent to the general secretary-treasurer."

Add to the last line of Section 4, page 23: "The Industrial Workers of the World shall not in any way be held responsible for the negligence, errors, mistakes or omissions of the financial secretaries of the local unions, or the local union itself."

The said Industrial Workers of the World hereby adopts the following design for a label, to be affixed to and designate

the product of the members of the said Industrial Workers of the World:

Said label may be varied in size and color, and may be affixed to such products either by stamping the same thereon, or by pasting the same thereon, or in any other convenient manner.

Wherever a local union or an Industrial Workers' Council shall enter into an agreement with a firm, or number of firms, by any organization of employers, such agreement shall first be submitted to the Executive Board of the Industrial Workers of the World for its approval before such agreement shall finally be adopted. Unless this section shall be complied with, it shall be the duty of the General Secretary-Treasurer of the Industrial Workers of the World to refuse to issue to such local union, or Industrial Workers' Council, the label of the Industrial Workers of the World.

The union label shall be the sole property of the Industrial Workers of the World, and the union stamp shall be loaned to the local unions or local Industrial Workers' Councils only when the foregoing section is complied with to the satisfaction of the Executive Board.

Any local union or local Industrial Workers' Council obtaining the union label under conditions other than those above stated shall be guilty of an offense against the Industrial Workers of the World, and for the first offense shall be punished by being deprived of the use of such label; for the second offense, shall be fined \$50.00, and for the third offense shall be suspended from the Industrial Workers of the World.

Upon application being made to the Executive Board for such union label, the Executive Board shall make a careful investigation as to the hours of labor, wages, and other conditions under which the members of such union are working, and the report of the same shall be published in the "Industrial Worker."

I would recommend that there be added to the constitution a clause, that the membership book which is issued to local unions holding charters directly affiliated with the Industrial Workers of the World be so arranged as to be good for two (2) years. This can be done by adding a leaf to the present form of membership book which we have at this time.

I would also recommend that the whole constitution be gone over very carefully by the constitution committee, and the constitution made so plain that no mistakes in the future can be made in the interpreting of the same. I also am of the belief that this convention, when deciding on the amended constitution, should instruct the Executive Board to submit the same to some reliable attorney for his inspection and advice thereon before putting the same into print, with power that minor changes might be made in case the legal adviser felt that such were necessary for the protection and the welfare of the organization from a legal standpoint.

Much has been said and written on the question of low dues. Your president would recommend that this convention not change the per capita tax to the general administration, with the exception as recommended herein on the question of female members.

PRES. SHERMAN: I desire to say in conclusion that any time that the Constitution Committee would like to have any explanation pertaining to the recommendations that I have made here I will gladly meet with you. And I would like to say to the convention in a few words, the most important committee that you have got is your Constitution Committee. Many of you have complained because of the fact that you are remaining so long in session. I want to say to you honestly, from experience, that if you expect this committee to do half of what I have heard is going to be done by this convention with this constitution, if you want to treat the committee honestly and fairly and expect them to do you good service, they ought to have at least four days—not nights after you have stretched here at those tables, but days after they have had a night's rest, that their minds may be clear and that they can work on your constitution; and that the longer you hold your committee here and they remain here with you in session, just so much longer will your Constitution Committee be not ready for their report. It requires time; I know this from actual experience in the past on several occasions that I have been working on constitutions. It is well enough to say that anything goes. Anything don't go. If your constitution is wrong in one or two words or phrases, if they get you into law, into the claws of the judicial power with judicial power, perhaps you would find that it would have been cheaper if you had given your Constitution Committee more time. A constitution has got to be got up right, and you have got a committee; I don't know how experienced they are in writing constitutions, but I don't care how experienced they are, they want from three to five days to get you up a good constitution; not nights, as I stated before, but days, so that they can rise from their beds and go to work with their minds clear. But it requires that to get out a constitution that you will accept, for you are thinking men and want a business administration and business constitution. That is all I have got to say. Well, once more I will say to the committee that any time that they want any explanation on this proposition that is offered here I will gladly meet with you. I will also say to the committee that if you want it I can furnish you with a copy of it. I have a copy of it in my office.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: We are going to send it all to the printer now. You may have it in twenty-four hours, printed.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: If there is no objection on the part of any delegate this will take the same course as the rest of the President's report and it will be printed also. Hearing none, it is so ordered.

#### MINUTES.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Does the convention at this time wish to dispense with the reading of the minutes of yesterday's meeting, or do they want them read?

ALT. KIEFFE: I want them read. Let them be read, Mr. Chairman. I move that they be read. It only takes ten minutes to read them.

A delegate moved to dispense with the reading. Seconded.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The reason I ask this question is this: I am of the opinion that there was somebody on the floor all day yesterday, that at all times there was somebody on the floor, and that at all times you were talking as fast as you could. Now, I take it that if the stenographer starts to read that off it will possibly take him as long to read it as it did in speaking it.

ALT. KIEFE: I would like to get a point of information. Don't the Secretary write down the minutes? I don't mean the stenographic report, but hasn't the Secretary got the minutes written down of yesterday's meeting?

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Probably the Secretary will answer the question.

THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY: I am now keeping no record except of the votes taken.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: It has been moved and seconded that we dispense with the reading of the minutes of yesterday's session.

DEL. HANNEMANN: I would like to make a correction in what I said last night. I used the words "doped brain," speaking of the workers. I intended to say "fagged brain." I would like to ask the stenographer, through the Chairman, to make that correction. Otherwise I stand the same as I did yesterday.

DEL. PARKS: I don't understand what the request is. I couldn't hear it.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The motion is that the reading of the minutes of yesterday's session be dispensed with at this time and that they be not read.

DEL. PARKS: I was referring to Del. Hannemann, of New York, to his request to change his speech of yesterday. I want to know what he wanted amended.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: If there is no objection on the part of any delegate to be recorded as voting in the affirmative on this motion it will be so ordered. Hearing none, it is so ordered.

(President Sherman here resumed the chair.)

#### MINUTES OF EXECUTIVE BOARD.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will now have the special order, the reading of the minutes of the Executive Board.

Sec. Trautmann then read the minutes of the General Executive Board, which are as follows:

#### FIRST SESSION OF THE GENERAL EXECUTIVE BOARD, INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD—SUNDAY AFTER-

NOON, JULY 9TH, 1905.

Meeting was called to order by President Chas. O. Sherman. Roll call showed all members present.

After few preliminary and introductory remarks a motion was made and carried to take up for consideration the matter of the location of headquarters. Executive members F. W. Cronin moved that this matter be left to the best judgment of the President and Secretary. Motion carried.

Next question taken under advisement was to find ways and means to start all the unions, and international unions, that had installed their membership at the convention, on a good working basis, as speedily as possible, owing to the evident misrepresentation the opponents of the movement would indulge in, in order to prevent the growth of the organization.

Motion was made and seconded that the general office equip all unions, formerly connected with the American Labor Union, and all those formerly parts of the Socialist Trades and Labor Alliance, and all others, not connected with an established department, with charter and steel-press-seal free of charge, the local organizations of the various departments to be supplied by their respective administration of the industrial departments with these outfits. Motion carried.

Motion made and seconded that the use of the universal seal be made mandatory upon all local unions chartered by the general office, or any international division or union. Carried.

A supplementary motion was made and carried that each international union, or rather industrial department be granted the right to control the issuance of such charters and seals. Motion carried.

Motion made and carried that three distinct seals be ordered for the designation of the general administration, the various departmental administrations and the local unions. Motion carried.

Motion made that the recommendation of the convention relative to headquarters of all departments being located in one place be concurred in, as the sense of the General Executive Board. Motion carried. Adjourned.

## SECOND SESSION OF THE EXECUTIVE BOARD—MONDAY MORNING, JULY 10TH, 1905.

Meeting was called to order by President Sherman at 10 o'clock A. M. Roll call showed the following members present: President Sherman, Secretary Trautmann, Chas. H. Moyer, Chas. Kirkpatrick, F. W. Cronin, John Riordan, and Fr. McCabe.

A motion was made and seconded to take up for consideration all matters referred to the Board by the convention. Carried.

The constitution was then gone over for revision.

After considerable discussion on many points the wording of the constitution, in different places, although not conflicting with the former meaning, was changed and altered, with the unanimous vote of all executive members on every change. The drawing up of by-laws, to be attached to the constitution was referred to committees, Fr. McCabe being selected as committee to draw up on ritual, and John Riordan and Kirkpatrick on By-laws, F. W. Cronin on drawing a sketch for a design. Announcement was made that the executive board members of the A. L. U. would be ready for a joint conference in the afternoon, so to reach an understanding as to the transfer, or sale respectively, of property of that organization.

## AFTERNOON SESSION.

Meeting called to order at two o'clock P. M. by President Chas. O. Sherman. The committee of the A. L. U. appeared, but stated they were not ready yet to go into joint conference. President Coates of that organization stated that he was at sea as to what should be brought before the board of the I. W. W., owing to the failure of the delegation of that body to hold a meeting to decide on what steps were to be taken for the transfer of the unions to the I. W. W. He made a general statement as to the standing of the organization, so likewise Clarence Smith, former General Secretary of that organization, both complaining and giving details as to the actual strength of the organization. No action could be taken until the A. L. U. officers were ready to submit a definite plan for the transfer of the property to the Industrial Workers of the World.

Next question taken up for consideration was the question of having a universal label and design in conformity with the provisions of the manifesto and the expressed sense of the convention.

The following motion carried unanimously:

"The Industrial Workers of the World shall have one universal label, for all goods made under such conditions as will be in accord with the pronounced principles advocated by the I. W. W. All universal labels, and the control over the issuance of same be governed by the general

officers, and rules for the issuance of the label to be drawn up in conformity with the general understanding expressed at the convention."

Announcement was made that the printer of the manifesto, Mr. Ed. R. Smith of the Joliet Republican Printing Co., was in the ante-room and would be ready to confer with the board relative to getting out the necessary outfit and supplies for the office and the organizations.

The remainder of the session was then taken up with talking with the printer over arrangements for the printing of supplies and charters, and sketches were drawn up for membership books, report blanks, charters, and orders placed with the printer. Meeting adjourned at half past six P. M., after a motion had passed, to reconvene at 9 o'clock A. M.

#### TUESDAY MORNING, JULY 11TH, 1905.

Meeting called to order by President Sherman at 9 A. M.

Minutes of the meeting of Sunday and Monday were read and found correct.

The membership book question was still up for discussion, and plans were submitted and discussed at length. On every question a unanimous opinion was arrived at, and orders immediately placed with the printer so to get the supplies out as quickly as possible.

The bank business question was next up for consideration. A motion prevailed that the General Secretary-Treasurer stands instructed to transact all business on financial lines with the Prairie State Bank, until further notice from the General Executive Board.

Question of bonding the officers was taken up next. Motion made, seconded and carried that the General Secretary-Treasurer be required to secure bonds to the amount of ten thousand dollars (10,000 dollars) with a reliable insurance company, to be decided on by the resident members of the executive board. Carried.

Motion made and carried that the President be required to secure bonds to the amount of five thousand dollars (\$5,000), subject to the same conditions as provided for the Secretary-Treasurer.

The bonds to be made payable to a member, or members, of the General Executive Board, such member or members to be elected by the board was the next motion made, and carried.

Chas. H. Moyer was by unanimous vote made the choice of the General Executive Board as President pro tem, in case of any vacancy occurring, or any other turn of affairs when the temporary filling of the place was necessary.

Motion made and carried that the Secretary-Treasurer be instructed to secure official blanks for checks of the I. W. W., as soon as finances would permit.

The question of compensation for the officers, having been referred by the convention to the General Executive Board, was then taken up.

Motion made and second that the President of the I. W. W. receive one hundred and fifty dollars (\$150.00) per month as fixed salary, three dollars (\$3.00) per day and transportation expenses when away from headquarters in the interest of the organization. After considerable discussion on the financial outlook for the organization motion carried unanimously.

Regularly moved and seconded that the Secretary-Treasurer receive same compensation in all particulars as the President. Amended that he shall receive one hundred and twenty-five dollars (\$125.00) per month, and three dollars per day and transportation expenses when away in the interest of the organization. After considerable discussion the amendment carried, four members voting for and one against the amendment. Original motion as amended then carried.



Motion made, seconded and carried after some discussion that the amount of salaries to be paid to the office employes of the I. W. W. be left to the judgment of the General President and General Secretary respectively.

Carried.

Motion made and duly seconded that the amount of compensation to be paid to the General Executive Board members be stipulated as follows: Members of the General Executive Board shall receive \$6.00 per day and transportation expenses while attending the meetings of the Executive Board, or traveling in the interest of the organization. (Carried.)

After a lengthy discussion, it was moved and seconded that the remuneration of organizers be left to the judgment of the President and he shall have the authority to appoint all organizers and general organizers and fix the compensation as conditions warrant, subject to the approval of the General Executive Board. (Carried.)

Motion carried to adjourn until 1:30 P. M.

#### AFTERNOON SESSION.

W. Shurtleff of New York, hitherto organizer of the A. L. U. in New York City, appeared before the Board, explaining conditions in that district and asking for allowances to be set aside for that district. The difficulties to be encountered in the organizing work in that part of the country were fully explained and also how the workers there would be organized if proper provisions be made. Thereupon the announcement was made that the delegation of the A. L. U. would be ready next day at 8 A. M. to appear before the General Executive Board.

Session adjourned at 6 P. M.

#### WEDNESDAY MORNING, JULY 12TH, 1905.

Meeting called to order by President Sherman at 10 o'clock. Roll call showed all members present. Meeting adjourned, so that the members could take an inventory of the property of the A. L. U., which had made overtures to turn over the property of the A. L. U. to the Industrial Workers of the World.

#### AFTERNOON SESSION.

Drawings for application blank were submitted, and, upon motion, adopted. Application blank for individual members submitted and also adopted. The design for the universal label submitted and adopted and the following rules passed by all members of the Board: That the universal label shall be the sole property of the Industrial Workers of the World, its issuance to be subject to control by the General Executive Board and with full publicity of arrangements made for its issuance to employers of labor. The union stamp and label shall be loaned to local unions, or International Industrial Departments when all provisions for its issuance have been complied with by the applicants for the universal label.

Resolution of Mill and Smeltermen's Local of Butte, Montana, relative to establishing an Educational Bureau of the Industrial Workers of the World, was taken up for consideration and the following resolution passed unanimously: "That all resolutions submitted by the convention to the Executive Board relative to educational matter be referred to the president and secretary-treasurer, with instructions to act thereon as soon as conditions will permit, subject to the approval of the General Executive Board."

Motion made by F. W. Cronin that action on the order of the convention and the constitution committee, relative to revising the constitu-

tion in some particular points, be deferred to some other future meeting of the Executive Board. Carried.

Pat O'Neil of Arkansas appeared before the Board and stated that he would be able to organize the district, as he already was representing 1,600 people at the convention and more would fall into line if the organizing work would be continued and the principles of Industrial Unionism more strenuously propagated. He asked for a commission as organizer. The Executive Board, being unable to grant him any compensation, promised that his application would be taken up at some future date. President Moyer of the Western Federation of Miners stated that he would be able to give O'Neil a commission soon, if he thought that the work of organizing the coal miners in that State should be taken up.

#### THURSDAY MORNING, JULY 13TH, 1905.

Meeting called to order by President Sherman. All members present. Motion made and carried that the three pamphlets referred by the convention to the Executive Board be placed in the hands of the general secretary-treasurer, to be turned over to the Bureau of Education, as soon as the same would be established. Carried.

Motion made that the financial affairs of the organization be taken up for consideration. Carried. The debts of the organization, contracted by Trautmann in the preliminary work prior to the convention and referred for settlement by the convention to the General Executive Board, were gone over and the motion carried unanimously that the bill of Trautmann, amounting to \$158.66, be allowed and that he have the authority to deduct the money from the funds of the organization as soon as they would accumulate. Carried.

The report of the organization committee of the convention was read and placed on file.

Motion made and carried that the secretary-treasurer be instructed to get sufficient letterheads and envelopes temporarily, until the Board had decided on an official letterhead.

Trautmann stated that he would have to leave for Cincinnati, as his ticket had run out and he had received an invitation from the convention of the American Flint Glass Workers to appear before that body and explain the principles of Industrial Unionism. With the approval of the members of the Board, he was allowed to proceed and on his way back from Cincinnati to address the convention in Martin's Ferry and to make overtures with some other bodies that might become interested in the Industrial Workers of the World.

#### FRIDAY, JULY 14TH, 1906.

All present, except W. E. Trautmann. The Executive Board of the A. L. U. and the I. W. W. met in joint conference and in consideration of all office fixtures, the Executive Board of the I. W. W. agreed to pay the indebtedness of the A. L. U. to St. Regis Lumbermen's Union No. 59, amounting to \$500.00; also indebtedness owing by the A. L. U. to Hudson Labor Union No. 16, amounting to \$125.00.

#### AFTERNOON SESSION.

The afternoon session was taken up in drafting forms and universal supplies. Ritual and by-laws were gone over and adopted, and ordered printed.

#### SATURDAY MORNING, JULY 15TH, 1906.

All members present, except Secretary Trautmann and F. W. Cronin. The action on other forms, printing and labels were taken up and continued for the balance of the day.

WM. E. TRAUTMANN, Secretary.

## SESSION OF JULY 23RD, 1906.

Meeting called to order by President Sherman at 2 P. M. Roll call showed the following members present: President C. O. Sherman, Secretary-Treasurer W. E. Trautmann, Charles H. Moyer, Charles Kirkpatrick, John Riordan and Frank McCabe. Meeting was called to take under consideration the constitution of the Transportation Department, drawn up by the Executive Board of the Railway Division of that Department. The constitution was thoroughly discussed and every clause taken up seriatim. The Board deemed it advisable to make the following alterations and submit same to the Executive Board of the Railway Division for action, so as to have the constitution altered in conformity with the recommendations.

The General Executive Board of the Industrial Workers of the World recommends to the Transportation Department the following changes in their constitution:

Strike out the following words in Article 2, Section d, line 6—"not be eligible to membership" and insert instead "become members in their particular industrial union."

In Article 4, Section 1, the Board recommends that the Transportation Department shall provide for an executive head of the organization, to be elected by referendum vote directly, the same as a general secretary-treasurer, and that all following articles and sections, where reference is made to a chairman of the General Board of Administration, be so amended to vest that executive power in the hands of the president.

Article 6, Section 3—The term of officers to be only one year at this time, so that the term of officers would expire in June, 1906, instead of 1907.

In Article 6, Section 7, no provision is made for a secret ballot by the membership in electing officers, or taking a referendum vote. Since every member is required to write his name on the ballot, the constitution must provide for a secret ballot.

Article 7, Section 1, to be changed so as to contain the following consensus of opinion: "The general executive authority shall be vested in a department-executive-head and a board of administration, consisting of eight (8) members for the time being, until more divisions of the department will be organized, in which case the board of administration shall be increased gradually to twenty-one (21) members, to be divided between the Industrial Unions in the Transportation Department, and the quota of representatives of each industrial division to be elected by same, through referendum vote."

All other sections not in accord with this opinion should be changed accordingly.

Article 8, Section 1, Line 10. Strike out the following words: "Expel without trial who participate in an illegal strike" as that would conflict with the fundamental principles of the Industrial Workers of the World."

Another recommendation, same section: "That no specifications will be made as to where the Executive Board members shall be chosen from, nor shall the Board of Administration meet every month. Once every three months should be sufficient to conduct the business of the organization."

These were the principal objections made and changes suggested by the General Executive Board.

No other business being before the board, the same adjourned.

WM. E. TRAUTMANN, Secretary.

## SPECIAL SESSION OF RESIDENT MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE BOARD, I. W. W.

Held September 25th, on the Tobacco Workers' Affair of Cleveland, O.

In absence of President Sherman the Secretary called meeting to order and called for nomination of chairman. Chas. Kirkpatrick was selected by unanimous consent. Present were: W. E. Trautmann, Secretary; John Riordan, Chas. Kirkpatrick, Fr. McCabe, and a representative of the tobacco workers union No. 89 of Cleveland, O.

The secretary explained the reasons for calling the meeting. He reviewed the causes leading to the organizing of stogie workers under a charter of the I. W. W. From communications on file he proved that the manufacturers from the first day on when the union organized were preparing for a fight, and were hiring cheaper hands to break them in as strikebreakers, in case of any trouble with the old employees, which was anticipated as soon as an organization was perfected. The General Secretary in his statement substantiated by the delegate from Cleveland, O., said he had advised the union to allow these apprentices to become members of the union so to upset the schemes of the employers, and the union acting upon that advice had taken in all apprentices as members. The later developments in the controversy not being known to him, as in the last report received, it was stated that the policy outlined by the general office was productive of the desired results, he was surprised to hear of a complete turn of affairs, since the secretary of the union, Fellow Worker David Hochwald, was sent to headquarters by the union, and unable to act on his own responsibility on a case as serious as that of the Cleveland tobacco workers, he had deemed it necessary to call a meeting of the resident members of the board.

The secretary of the Cleveland stogie workers' union, David Hochwald, supplemented the report of conditions leading to a conflict now. He showed how the manufacturers had finally established a blacklist, with the object of destroying the organization. He proved that the bosses would accomplish their object if resistance was not offered, and because of the busy season in the stogie trade it would be the most opportune time to show the employers the strength of the organization. Hochwald claimed that the employees would surely win, if only a little support would be given them, that the organization would be a thing of the past if quick action would not be taken.

The Secretary and Executive Board Member Kirkpatrick gave the delegate a full explanation of the financial side of it, and showed that the general executive board had no right to vote financial assistance to the employees if they would go out on strike. Hochwald contended that the assurance of support would suffice to strengthen the case of the men and women.

Executive Board Member McCabe insisted that the union go through the regular channel, that committees be appointed to meet with the employers or to ask them for a conference with a view of arbitrating the difference, and that if arbitration failed the union should submit the grievance before the general executive board in writing.

Hochwald contended that his former explanation was sufficient to show that such a policy of delay would give the employers more chances to be prepared, and that he was under the impression that the I. W. W. was employing different methods than the old unions of the A. F. of L. Assurance was given the delegate that red-tape procedures were not intended but that precaution had to be taken to assure a success in case of trouble.

Finally the secretary was instructed to draw up the demands to be submitted to the employers.

The demands to be made and stipulated as follows:

First—An increase of ten per cent in wages for all employes, equivalent to 25c increase on 1,000 stogies made.

Second—The abolishing of the blacklist.

Third—One apprentice to be allowed on every ten employes. The demands were endorsed. The delegate from Cleveland was instructed to return home and call a meeting of the union, a committee to be appointed to present the demands to the employers.

A motion was made and carried that the secretary wire the organizer, Paul Dinger, to co-operate with the union.

Motion carried to immediately inform President Sherman to stop on his way home in Cleveland to endeavor to reach a settlement without a strike being necessary.

Motion made and carried that should a strike be necessary immediately a call for voluntary contributions be issued to all unions and supporters of the I. W. W.

Meeting adjourned.

WM. E. TRAUTMANN, Secretary.

#### SESSION OF RESIDENT MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE BOARD.

Held October 9th, 1905.

All resident members were present. President Sherman called session to order at 2 o'clock P. M.

A general review of the conditions of the entire organization was given by both the president and secretary. The difficulties in getting the former A. L. U. unions in line in the State of Montana were discussed at length.

Secretary Trautmann stated that the financial report would be ready to be sent to all unions, but the report would strengthen the hands of the opponents of the movement, and give Fairgrieve and his followers a chance to assert that the Western Federation of Miners had refused to become part of the I. W. W., a story being circulated already among the western unions to discourage them from becoming a part of the I. W. W. Motion made and carried unanimously not to send out report until the situation be explained to the executive board members of the Western Federation of Miners, and the President and Secretary were instructed to write a joint communication to President Chas. H. Moyer and Secretary-Treasurer Haywood.

The strike of the stogieworkers of Cleveland was then reviewed. Chas. Sherman stated that he had gone to Cleveland, as per instructions, and had found the strike in full blast with fair chances to win if proper support would be forthcoming. Secretary Trautmann, who had been sent to Cleveland by President Sherman, gave report to what extent he had provided for the support of the strikers while in Cleveland, and that the strike would surely be won because of the way same was conducted.

The reports were received.

A communication was then read of the board of directors of the Transportation Department, to-wit:  
To the General Executive Board of the I. W. W.—Brothers:

For the past two years the U. B. R. E. has been engaged in a severe struggle against the antagonism of the craft brotherhoods in the railway service and the watchful and no less bitter antagonism of the railway corporations, who fear the industrial form of organization and propose to "blot" it out of existence, if possible, on the railways. This struggle, together with the C. P. R. R. strike two years ago, which involved our organization under a heavy load of indebtedness, has kept

our treasury department depleted, and the officers of the organization have been without resources and unable to keep the organization before the workers. For the past year we have been entirely without organizers in the field, on account of lack of funds, and this has resulted in a continuous falling off in membership; at the time of the industrial convention in June our membership was reduced to 2,087, and only 1,100 were shown to have paid dues for the month of June.

While the July reports show only 570 members in good standing (due to the fact that many of our locals have been in a state of confusion since the convention, regarding the status of the U. B. R. E. and its relationship to the I. W. W. and, hence, the holding back of their reports until such confusion shall be cleared) we think that it will be a conservative statement to report the membership in good standing in the Transportation Department 1,000 at this time.

This membership is strong, earnest and militant. Thoroughly versed in the underlying principles of Industrial Unionism. In most part they have been in our organization for the past five years and will be zealous workers for our movement, provided we place in their hands the necessary literature for propaganda work.

Reports which we are receiving from all parts of the country daily, both from our locals and from others not members of our organization, indicate that the workers in the various sub-divisions of the Transportation Department are deeply interested in our movement, and we feel confident that, when our constitution and other literature is placed in their hands and they are made familiar with the general plans of the organization, in the course of a few months we will be able to organize the Department, not only to be self-sustaining, but likewise to be a strong support to the I. W. W.

We are at present, however, confronted with a serious problem in the matter of immediate finances, as the following summary will show: The membership which will be in good standing on the first day of September, while as yet indefinite if placed at 1,000, which we believe to be a conservative estimate, will make the total available resources of the Department to be \$250.00 per month.

Current expenses will be as follows:

Per capita tax to the I. W. W. on 1,000 members.....	\$ 83.33
Office rent .....	8.00
Incidental office expense (stamps, stationery, etc.).....	20.00
<b>Total .....</b>	<b>\$111.33</b>
<b>Total resources .....</b>	<b>\$250.00</b>
<b>Total expenses .....</b>	<b>111.33</b>
<b>Balance .....</b>	<b>\$138.67</b>

This will leave a general balance of \$138.67 for the payment of salaries and expenses of officers, printing and other indeterminate expenditures.

We feel that, under these circumstances, unless we can be aided in some manner it will be impossible for us to conduct a vigorous campaign of organizing work.

In view of these facts, the Board of Directors of the Transportation Department would request that the General Executive Board of the I. W. W. grant a loan to the Transportation Department of five hundred dollars (\$500.00), such loan to be made during a period of five (5) months in monthly allowances of one hundred dollars (\$100.00) each month, beginning with the month of September; such loan to consist in part of the regular monthly per capita tax due from the Transporta-

tion Department, monthly due books and such other supplies as may be furnished to the Transportation Department by the I. W. W.; and, should there be any balance left from the \$100.00 per month allowance, it be furnished in funds to aid us from time to time in getting out printed matter. The Transportation Department will repay such loan just as soon as we are in shape to do so.

We feel that, if you will extend this support to our Department at this time, we will be able, in the time specified, to place our organization on a good sound basis, both financially and otherwise, and in the near future will be able to repay all of our indebtedness to the I. W. W.

Trusting that this request will meet with your approval and that your actions will be communicated to us at your earliest convenience, we remain,

Faternally,

A. W. MORROW,  
WM. HICKEY,  
W. GOLDSWORTHY,  
LEE KOHL,  
Members of the Board.

FRANK McCABE,  
Chairman of Board.

W. L. HALL,  
General Secretary-Treasurer.

Motion made and carried to receive the communication and act on the request.

Considerable discussion ensued as to the standing of the Transportation Department. The secretary stated that due stamps and supplies were furnished to that department, membership of which was not known to him, but that no payment had been received from the department.

McCabe explained the conditions in the department.

Motion made to continue assisting the Transportation Department to the extent of giving the due stamps and release the department temporarily from payment of taxes to the general administration.

Motion carried.

Meeting adjourned at 6 o'clock P. M.

#### SESSION ON OCTOBER 10TH, 1905.

All resident members present. Meeting called to order at 2:30 P. M. by President Sherman.

By-laws of L. U. No. 144, Power Workers of Denver, were read and different changes suggested in conformity with the constitution.

By-laws of Industrial Workers Union of Jersey City, N. J., were read and approved without changes, these by-laws being commendable for adoption by every mixed local union.

By-laws of Peoria, Ill., local union were approved as read.

Communications between the organizer of Flat River, Mo., and the secretary of the clerks' union were submitted, also proposed draft of agreement to be submitted to the store keepers of Flat River. As the contract submitted by the clerks' union was not in conformity with established principles of the I. W. W. the recommendations of Organizer Brown were concurred in. The clerks' union was requested to change the contract to call for the release of employees after ten hours' daily work, and that overtime be paid at the rate of one and a half for all work done over the stipulated hours. The contract submitted provided for the closing of stores at certain hours. The executive board members concurred in the opinions expressed by Organizer Brown, to the effect that the organization should have no power to dictate the closing hours as long as the employers only agreed to pay for labor they employ during the time they are doing their business.

A further clause ordered stricken out was the last one, reading: "That both parties recognize each other's interest to be identical and that both parties agree to further the mutual interests of either."

Bill of expenses incurred by D. Scoggan of Lead, S. Dak., in organizing a union in Belle Fourche was submitted. Motion carried to pay half of the bill and sent a letter of explanation to the parties concerned. The bill being \$33 the secretary was instructed to pay \$16.50 to Scoggan.

Applications for the grant of the union printers cut were received from the unions in Pueblo, Colo., for Printer Fossdieck, from Kansas City for Printer Howard, from New Orleans for a printer member, and as the unions agreed to comply with the rules of supervising the use of the label, same was granted.

Several communications were read from W. Shurtleff, secretary of the International Musical Union. He submitted membership card for musicians for approval, also constitution for the Public Service Department. The secretary stated the standing of the musicians in the A. L. U. as being an international union connected with that body, and judging from the manner they were united with that body he had recognized that union as an international subdivision. Owing to the fact that the international musical union had not installed itself as a departmental union or part thereof, the consideration of any constitution submitted by that organization was declared out of order and the secretary was instructed to communicate as far as possible with the secretaries of the various musician unions and explain their standing in the I. W. W.

Communication was received from the Industrial Workers Union of Paterson, N. J., relative to organizing the silk workers, and the obstacles which have to be overcome. Some suggestions were submitted for action thereon by the board.

Motion made and carried to remit for female members ten cents per member per month to the union, the same to apply to juniors, and the names of such members to be forwarded every month with the monthly report.

Motion made and carried to allow wage earners of a given nationality to form unions of their own in the respective industries in which they are employed, and where there are not enough to form unions of that kind the parent unions shall allow the members, who best command other than the English language, to have branch meetings for educational purposes.

Matter of the Pawtucket, R. I., textile workers was taken up. A letter was read from the union explaining why they could not afford to pay the dues. Emerged from a long fight with weakened forces the union had to pay off debts contracted, and this was the reason why the members, if they would take out a charter from the I. W. W., would not be able to pay the dues.

Motion carried to grant the union a charter and outfit, as having been a part of the S. T. and L. A., and release the members from paying dues till January first, 1906, at which time the union may determine whether able to pay dues right along. If under these conditions the union will accept a charter the due stamps be given until the time set when payment should commence.

Meeting adjourned.

WM. E. TRAUTMANN.

MEETING OF RESIDENT MEMBERS HELD ON OCTOBER 18TH.

All resident members were present.

President Sherman explained the reasons for calling the board together. Owing to the propaganda among the machinists and other metal workers the excitement and ire of the officers of the A. F. of L. unions



had been aroused, and an ultimatum had been issued forbidding the discussion of industrial unionism in the shops, under penalties to be imposed by the machinist union for violators of this rule. This arbitrary act had acted like a boomerang and the machinists, if proper steps be taken, could be organized under the I. W. W. Knowing the activity of the members of Pioneer Union of the I. W. W. he had entertained the suggestion to select the most active of them as organizer of the I. W. W., and would recommend to the board to affirm the appointment.

All members of the board coinciding with the views the member in question was called in. He again reviewed the situation, and recommended quick action to obtain the best and immediate results in the organizing work. When asked whether he would accept the position as organizer he gave his reasons, why he would have to be assured at least permanent employment till May, 1906, that he had a good job now and that he would rather see the union of which he is a member make the selection as organizer.

After he again retired motion was made to pay the organizer \$23 per week, this to include his expenses.

W. E. Tullar agreed to work for \$20.00 per week, his expenses to be paid weekly as incurred, but they would probably not be higher than three dollars per week.

Motion amended to comply with the request and to assure the organizer permanency of employment until next convention of the I. W. W. Motion as amended carried. President Sherman agreed to notify Pioneer Union of the election of Tullar as organizer.

Meeting then adjourned.

WM. E. TRAUTMANN.

#### MEETING OF THE GENERAL EXECUTIVE BOARD, HELD MONDAY, JANUARY 8TH, 1906.

Meeting was called to order at 10 o'clock A. M. The following members responded to roll call: President Chas. O. Sherman, Secretary W. E. Trautmann, John Riordan, Chas. H. Moyer, F. W. Crowning, Chas. G. Kirkpatrick and Frank McCabe.

Minutes of sessions held on September 25th by resident members were read and approved by the Executive Board.

Minutes of sessions held on October 8th and 9th by resident members were read. Motion made and seconded to approve the minutes as read. Carried.

Minutes of session held on October 18th by resident members were read. Motion made by Cronin and seconded by Moyer that minutes be approved as read, and that the election of W. E. Tullar as organizer and the conditions of his employment be endorsed. Motion carried.

Motion made by Chas. Moyer and seconded by McCabe that minutes of session held on July 9th, 10th, 11th and 12th, 13th and 14th, 1905, and approved, be read. Carried. Minutes were then read and were approved without correction.

Motion made by Cronin, and seconded by Chas. Moyer, that the Board adjourn until 1:30 P. M., and upon re-convening go over and audit the accounts of the general secretary-treasurer. Motion carried.

#### MONDAY, JANUARY 8TH—AFTERNOON SESSION.

Upon re-convening at 1:30 P. M., a motion was made and seconded that the Board, with the exception of the President and the Secretary, constitute itself a committee of auditors. Motion carried. The secretary was allowed to retire and tend to his other duties.

## TUESDAY, JANUARY 9TH, 1906.

Meeting called to order at 9 o'clock A. M. Present: Chas. O. Sherman, W. E. Trautmann, Chas. H. Moyer, John Riordan, Frank McCabe, F. W. Cronin and Chas. H. Kirkpatrick.

Minutes of session held on January 8th were read. Motion made to approve the minutes as read. Motion carried. The committee of auditors then again resumed the work of going over the accounts of the organization.

## WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 10TH, 1906.

All members of the Executive Board were present when the meeting was called to order at 9 o'clock A. M. Chas. O. Sherman, W. E. Trautmann, Chas. H. Moyer, John Riordan, Frank McCabe and Chas. G. Kirkpatrick. Auditors continued the audit of the books and accounts. Adjourned at 12 o'clock noon.

## AFTERNOON SESSION.

The auditors continued, after re-convening at 2 o'clock, the auditing of books, and adjourned at 6 o'clock P. M.

## THURSDAY, JANUARY 11TH.

All members of the Executive Board were present when meeting was called to order at 9 o'clock, A. M.: Chas. O. Sherman, W. E. Trautmann, Chas. H. Moyer, John Riordan, Frank McCabe, F. W. Cronin and Chas. G. Kirkpatrick. Minutes of session of previous meeting were read and, upon motion, approved as read. The auditors continued to audit the books and accounts and finished the work at 11 o'clock A. M. President Sherman called the meeting to order at 11 o'clock A. M. F. W. Cronin announced that the auditors had recommendations to make.

Motion made by Kirkpatrick, and seconded by McCabe, that when a motion is made a record be taken of the name of the mover of the motion and the second. Motion carried.

By-laws of Bakery Workers' Union No. 7 of Butte, Montana, were then taken up for consideration. Every section was considered seriatim, and the following clauses were discussed and either approved or amended: Section 2 of the by-laws of Local Union No. 7 created a discussion. Moved by Cronin, and seconded by McCabe, that the section be adopted as read. Carried—six members voting the affirmative; Kirkpatrick voting against the motion to approve.

Motion made by Cronin, and seconded by Chas. H. Moyer, that in section 25 of the by-laws of Local Union No. 7 the following words be inserted: "or the Industrial Workers of the World." Carried.

The by-laws of Local Union No. 7 were then approved as amended and corrected.

By-laws of Local Union No. 182, Colorado City, Colo., were next taken up for consideration. In Article I, a motion was made by Trautmann, and seconded by Riordan, that Section 3 of that article be so amended: the words "persons" be stricken out and the words "wage-earners" be inserted. Motion carried.

In Article II, Section 5, of these by-laws, a motion was made by Cronin and seconded by McCabe that it read as follows: "The Executive Board of the union shall appoint three judges of election." Motion was carried unanimously.

Article II, Section 7, of these by-laws was discussed at length. A motion was then made by Cronin, and seconded by Chas. Moyer, that the following words be stricken out: "immediately after the hour of 8:30" and also the following lines in the same section: "and the same subject may be pursued under the head of Good and Welfare." Motion carried.

In Section 8 of Article II it was moved by Cronin and seconded by McCabe that the following lines be stricken out: "In no case shall a withdrawal card be granted to anyone." Carried. Section 3 of Article II to be changed, and the following words be inserted: "on the application blanks of the I. W. W."

In Article III, Section 3, a motion was made by Cronin, and seconded by Moyer, that the union be advised to make the rules comply with Section 3, Article III, of the general constitution. A general discussion ensued.

A motion was made by John Riordan, and seconded by Moyer, that it is the sense of the General Executive Board that Section 3, Article III, be so construed that local unions, directly chartered by the I. W. W., shall charge an initiation fee not lower than two dollars (\$2.00), and not more than five dollars (\$5.00). Motion carried.

Dinner time having arrived, the meeting adjourned until 1:30 P. M.

#### THURSDAY AFTERNOON, JANUARY 11TH.

The meeting was called to order by President Sherman at 2 o'clock. All members were present.

The consideration of by-laws of Local Union No. 182 was continued. Article III, Section 4, was amended, according to motion made by Riordan and seconded by McCabe, that the "monthly dues shall not be less than 50 cents per month per member." Motion carried.

Motion made by Moyer, and seconded by Kirkpatrick, that Section 10, Article III, have the following words inserted: "Subject to the approval of the General Executive Board." Carried.

A motion was made by Cronin, and seconded by Riordan, that the by-laws of Local Union No. 182, of Colorado City, be approved as amended. Motion carried.

The next matter taken up were the by-laws of the Industrial Council of New York. Every clause was read and considered seriatim. The secretary read the objections of four unions against clause 4 of the by-laws.

A motion was made by Cronin, and seconded by McCabe, that the section be changed as follows:

"Open public meetings may be held for the purpose of discussing social, industrial and working class economics." Motion carried.

A motion was made by Moyer, and seconded by Kirkpatrick, that the constitution and by-laws of the Industrial Council of New York be adopted as amended. Motion carried.

A lengthy communication was read, containing a protest of the Emancipation Club of Los Angeles, Cal., against the action of the president and secretary, in denying and revoking the charter of that organization. A full explanation was given, corroborated by the documents and letters exchanged between the various parties.

A motion was made by Cronin, and seconded by Moyer, that the action of the president and the secretary be approved, and that the protest of the Emancipation Club be considered disposed of, as the Executive Board recognizes Local Union No. 12 of Los Angeles, Cal., as the bona fide mixed union of the I. W. W. Motion carried.

The protest of the Waiters' and Restaurant Employees' Union of New York City against the interpretation of the constitution by the president was read. President Sherman gave his views and explanation. Motion made by Moyer, and seconded by McCabe, that the decision of the president of the I. W. W. be approved and that the union be notified in writing of the decision. Motion carried.

A communication was received from a tailor employing members of the I. W. W., of Chicago. He asked for permission to use the mailing

list to sample goods. A lively discussion ensued. Motion made by Cronin, and seconded by Kirkpatrick, that the editor of the paper, "The Industrial Worker," be instructed to occasionally refer to the fact that garments bearing the I. W. W. label can be procured from the manufacturer employing I. W. W. members. Motion carried.

The cap makers' affair was then taken up for consideration. No action taken.

Appeal of cement workers of Spokane was read, and the president of the I. W. W. advised to communicate with the organization and explain to them the forms of industrial unionism.

The by-laws of New Orleans local were then taken up for consideration. Moved by Cronin, seconded by Kirkpatrick, that the words "of the age of 18 years" be stricken out, and the by-laws be adopted as so amended. Motion carried.

The hour of six o'clock having arrived, the Board adjourned.

#### FRIDAY, JANUARY 12TH, 1906.

Meeting was called to order by President Sherman at 9 o'clock A. M. Present: Chas. Sherman, W. E. Trautmann, Chas. H. Moyer, Frank Cronin, John Riordan, C. G. Kirkpatrick and Frank McCabe.

Minutes of sessions of previous day were read. Motion made by Cronin, seconded by Kirkpatrick, that minutes be approved as read. Motion carried.

A letter was read from Organizer Shurtleff, of New York, in which he conveyed the information that a cap factory of New York was employing I. W. W. members and had agreed to use the universal label. The cap makers' affair was then taken up again and the situation thoroughly discussed.

A motion was made by Kirkpatrick, seconded by Riordan, that a leaflet be drawn up, setting forth the origin and the occurrences in the cap makers' controversy. Motion carried, Moyer and Cronin voting against the motion. Chas. Moyer explained the reasons for his negative vote.

President Sherman then read a lengthy report of the work of the past six months. The report contained several recommendations.

Moved by Cronin, seconded by McCabe, that the recommendation of the president relative to appointment of editor and his compensation be approved, and that the appointment of the editor be made permanent. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion made by Cronin, seconded by McCabe, that no call for department conventions be issued until after the next convention of the general organization. Motion carried unanimously.

A discussion ensued on the trips of the president and organizing work. President Sherman read a letter received by him from the Transportation Department. A motion was made by Moyer, seconded by Cronin, that the communication received from the Transportation Department be received by the Executive Board, that same has been considered, that the request contained in that letter be complied with, and that the Board recognizes L. M. Kohl as secretary of that department. Motion carried.

John Riordan wished to be recorded as voting against that motion.

A motion was made by Moyer, and seconded by Cronin, that the president of the I. W. W. notify the Board of Directors of the Transportation Department of the action of the Executive Board of the I. W. W. Motion amended by Trautmann, amendment seconded by Riordan, that the retiring secretary of the Transportation Department be also notified of the action of the Executive Board. Amendment carried—four

being in favor, two against. Sherman and McCabe voting against the amendment. Motion, as amended, carried unanimously.

Frank McCabe referred to charges brought against him before the Board of Directors of the Transportation Department by Secretary Trautmann. After a lengthy explanation of the situation of the department, a motion was made by Cronin and seconded by Riordan that "the General Executive Board of the I. W. W. recommends to the Board of Directors of the Transportation Department that a referendum vote should be called among the members of that Department, on the proposition that the unions be directly attached to the general organization until such time as the Transportation Department may be organized sufficiently strong that the opponents cannot work injuries on those joining the organization." Motion carried.

The matter of the appointment of Schulberg as organizer was left to the president of the I. W. W. for action. Motion carried.

Motion made by Cronin, seconded by Kirkpatrick, that the report of the president be approved as a whole, and all actions endorsed. Motion carried.

Motion was made by Moyer, seconded by Cronin, that the officers of the I. W. W. be instructed to proceed at once to secure bonds, as provided by the constitution of the I. W. W. Motion carried.

Chas. Moyer, thereupon, read documents and extracts of the minutes of the last executive session of the Western Federation of Miners. He stated that the Executive Board had elected four delegates to the convention of the I. W. W., that every union of the Western Federation of Miners was instructed to select an I. W. W. organizer, subject to the approval of the president of the I. W. W. He also dwelt, at length, on the financial affairs of the organization.

Motion made by Cronin, seconded by McCabe, that six thousand dollars (\$6,000) be remitted to the Mining Department for relief in strikes and legal expenses. Motion carried.

Moved by Kirkpatrick, seconded by Riordan, that the secretary-treasurer of the I. W. W. be instructed to remit fifty per cent of dues received from the Mining Department until the full amount of \$6,000, due for relief, be liquidated. Motion carried.

President Moyer, thereupon, stated that he had made an error in the sum and that the amount of \$432.50, as paid prior to the I. W. W. convention, be deducted.

Motion made by Cronin and seconded by McCabe that the correction be made as stated by Chas. Moyer.

Moved by Riordan, seconded by Trautmann, to re-consider the motion in reference to paying the Mining Department \$6,000. Motion carried.

Moved by Riordan that the General Executive Board pay to the Mining Department the sum of \$5,832.00 for strike relief and court expenses. Motion was seconded.

Recommendations of the Mining Department, relative to organizers, was taken up for consideration. Moved by Kirkpatrick, seconded by Riordan, that the recommendations be complied with. Motion carried.

Motion made by Cronin, seconded by McCabe, that the recommendation relative to organizing the coal miners be concurred in. Motion carried.

Motion made by Cronin, seconded by McCabe, that the communication of the Executive Board of the W. F. of M., relative to the holding of the convention, be accepted. Contents noted and the suggestions concurred in. Carried.

Motion made by Moyer, seconded by Cronin, that the convention of the I. W. W. be called for June 27th, subject to the approval of the entire membership, by a referendum vote. Carried.

Motion made by Kirkpatrick, seconded by Moyer, that Chicago be the place of the convention. Motion carried.

Chas. Moyer entered protest against the secretary-treasurer being allowed to go into the field, as his work in the office would require all his time.

Meeting adjourned at 6:30 P. M.

#### SATURDAY, JANUARY 15TH, 1906.

Meeting called to order at 9 o'clock A. M. by President Sherman.

Motion was made to adjourn until 1:30 P. M., as the Metal Department Executive Board was in session and wished to complete the constitution and have same ready for endorsement in the afternoon. Motion carried.

#### AFTERNOON SESSION.

Meeting was called to order at 2 o'clock by President Sherman. All members of the Board were present. Secretary read the minutes of the meeting of previous day.

F. W. Cronin objected against the part of the minutes relative to the sum to be paid to the Western Federation of Miners and stated that the motion was for the sum of \$5,800. McCabe moved that minutes be corrected accordingly. Motion carried, Riordan wishing to be recorded as voting against the correction.

Cronin objected to the part referring to postponement of convention; that it should read that the Board recommends that the convention be changed from May to June 27th. Correction made and recorded.

Motion made that minutes be approved as corrected, carried, Riordan voting against the motion, and Trautmann recorded as not voting at all.

President Sherman brought up the matter of an exhibition of union labels arranged by the Chicago Arbeiter Zeitung. Motion made by Cronin, seconded by McCabe, that the matter be left to the judgment of the President of the organization. Carried.

The constitution of the Metal Department was then read. Motion made by Cronin, seconded by McCabe, that the constitution be approved. Carried.

By-laws of Local Union No. 12, of Los Angeles, were then read. Motion made by Cronin, seconded by Kirkpatrick, that the by-laws be approved as read.

By-laws of Local Union No. 93, of Bingham, Utah, were read. Motion made by Cronin, seconded by McCabe, that the by-laws be approved as read. Carried.

By-laws of local union No. 157, of New Bedford, Mass., were then read. Moved by Cronin, seconded by McCabe, that the by-laws be approved as amended, and refer the union to the clause relative to political parties. Carried.

Letters from Organizer Brown, of Flat River, Mo., relative to the Retail Clerk's Union of that place, were read. Moved by Cronin, seconded by Kirkpatrick, that the matter be referred to Chas. H. Moyer, as he was about to visit the Flat River district.

Auditing committee then reported. Same had gone over all accounts and finances on hand and examined all books. While money in the bank and outstanding vouchers corresponded with the books, they found two vouchers designating larger sums to be paid out than entered upon the books. The secretary-treasurer should find these mistakes before approval of financial management could be given.

The following recommendations of the auditors were read, and incorporated as rules to govern the officers:

The secretary-treasurer must report monthly to the Executive Board members, as provided for in the constitution.

Secretary to confine his time to the office, unless consent to absent himself be obtained from the Executive Board.

The president to see that expense for office help and organizers be so regulated and fixed, so as to be on a basis with money on hand, so that the debts contracted by the organization can be paid off.

Motion made by Cronin, seconded by McCabe, that the president and secretary-treasurer arrangement of office help and wages as fixed be approved. Motion carried.

Trautmann made a motion that the Executive Board of the I. W. W. endorse the resolution passed by the Executive Board of the Western Federation of Miners in the last session, extending encouragement and support to the workers of Russia in their heroic struggle for freedom. Motion carried.

The affair of the Montana State Federation, and the disrupting work done by the leaders of the organization was then taken up. Moyer moved that the President and the Secretary of the I. W. W. procure copies of the resolution sent out by the Western Federation of Miners, and serve the locals of the I. W. W. with a like resolution of instructions. Motion carried.

The auditing committee also recommended that in the next examination of books they expect to find a check corresponding with the amount of the vouchers, also for all cash payments a check covering all cash payments for current month be drawn on the Secretary-Treasurer at the end of every month. Recommendation was adopted.

Moved by Kirkpatrick, seconded by Riordan, that the Secretary-Treasurer procure a statement as to the numerical strength and growth of the I. W. W. and the unions, and send it to all members of the Executive Board, not later than the end of January. Carried.

Moved by Cronin, seconded by McCabe, that the matter of getting a hall for the convention be left to the President and the Secretary-Treasurer, and resident members. Carried.

No further business being before the Board, adjournment was announced at 7 o'clock p. m.

WM. E. TRAUTMANN, Secretary.

#### GENERAL SESSION OF THE ENTIRE EXECUTIVE BOARD OF THE I. W. W.

Monday, July 9th, 1906.

President Chas. O. Sherman called meeting to order at 1 o'clock p. m.

The following members responded to the roll call:

Chas. O. Sherman, President.

W. E. Trautmann, Secretary.

C. E. Mahoney, in place of Chas. H. Moyer.

John Riordan, Chas. G. Kirkpatrick, F. W. Cronin, Frank McCabe.

The reading of minutes was temporarily dispensed with and the executive members proceeded at once to audit the accounts of the organization. Adjournment at 6 o'clock p. m.

Tuesday, July 10th.

All members present at 9 o'clock a. m. Auditors continued to go over the accounts of the organization. Adjournment at 12 o'clock m.

Afternoon.

Board members convened at 1:30 p. m. and continued auditing books. Adjournment taken at 6 o'clock p. m.

Wednesday, July 11th, 1906.

All members of the executive board convened at 9 o'clock a. m. and continued auditing the accounts of the organization. Adjournment 12 o'clock.

Afternoon Session.

Reconvening at 1:30 p. m. the auditors continued the work of going over the accounts of the organization. Adjourned 6 o'clock p. m.

Thursday, July 12th, 1906.

All members of the board were present at 9 o'clock a. m. Auditing of books was continued. Adjourned 12 o'clock m.

Afternoon.

Reconvening at 1:30 the Executive Board members continued to audit the books, and adjourned at 6 o'clock p. m.

Friday, July 13th, 1906.

All members were present at 9 o'clock a. m. when the auditing of books was continued.

At 11 o'clock the full board went into session, to act on the request of a committee of railway workers to grant them a hearing. Moved by C. E. Mahoney, seconded by John Riordan, that the shorthand writer be called in to take down stenographically the statements to be presented by the committee. Motion carried.

A committee of transportation workers then appeared and the board remained in session for three hours to hear the statements on the alleged illegal suspension of unions formerly connected with the transportation department. Adjournment taken at 2:45 p. m.

Friday Afternoon Session.

President Chas. O. Sherman called meeting to order at 2:45. The following members responded to the roll call.

Chas. O. Sherman, President.

W. E. Trautmann, Secretary.

C. E. Mahoney, in place of Chas. H. Moyer.

John Riordan, F. W. Cronin, Chas. G. Kirkpatrick and Frank McCabe.

Minutes of meetings held July 9th, 10th, 11th and 12th were read and approved with slight corrections.

President Chas. O. Sherman submitted communications received from representatives of the Woodsmen, Constructors and Laborers' International Union. After thorough discussion of the contents a motion was offered by C. E. Mahoney, seconded by Chas. G. Kirkpatrick, that this matter be left in the hands of the president. Motion carried.

Secretary-Treasurer read the minutes of the sessions held from January 8th inclusive to January 15th inclusive. Slight corrections were noted and recorded. Minutes were approved as read and corrected.

The auditing committee reported on matter of finances of the organization, entering protest against the payment of funds for strike relief, without approval of the board. The Secretary-Treasurer admitted the illegality of action, and strike expenditures, but giving his valid reasons for such a procedure.

A letter from Organizer Shurtleff received by President Chas. O. Sherman, was read. Conditions in the conflict of the Papermakers' Union No. 313 in New Haven were described, and recommendations offered.

Motion made by F. W. Cronin, seconded by Frank McCabe, that the communication be referred to the President for action.

Roll call vote on the motion was asked for.

Voting no: W. E. Trautmann, C. E. Mahoney, John Riordan, Chas. G. Kirkpatrick.



Voting yes: W. F. Cronin, Frank McCabe.

Motion lost.

Moved by Kirkpatrick, seconded by Riordan, that \$50.00 be granted to Shurtleff for organizing purposes. Carried.

The financial affairs were again taken up.

Motion made by C. E. Mahoney, seconded by Trautmann, that no money be paid out of the fund for strike relief except in compliance with the constitution and approved by the General Executive Board.

Amendment offered by F. W. Cronin, seconded by McCabe, that no more money be paid for strike relief without strict compliance with the constitution.

With the consent of the members of the board the motion made by Mahoney was withdrawn.

Cronin's substitute was made the original motion.

Amendment offered by Riordan, seconded by Trautmann, "That no more money be paid for strike relief without strict compliance with the constitution or sanctioned by the members of the General Executive Board."

Amendment was lost, two votes in favor, four against.

A lengthy discussion ensued on the motion, and its interpretation and construction of same.

Motion carried—John Riordan wishing to be recorded as voting against the motion.

The hour of 8 o'clock having arrived the meeting adjourned.

Meeting held Saturday, July 14th, 1906.

Meeting was called to order at 9 o'clock a. m. by President Sherman. The following members of the board responded to roll-call: Chas. O. Sherman, President; W. E. Trautmann, Secretary; C. E. Mahoney, in place of Chas. H. Moyer; John Riordan, F. W. Cronin, Chas. G. Kirkpatrick, Frank McCabe.

Minutes of previous day's session were read, and after few corrections made, adopted as corrected.

The matter of moneys received for the Moyer-Haywood Defense Fund and expenses incurred, and paid from the general funds of the I. W. W. was taken up for discussion.

Motion made by Mahoney, seconded by Cronin, to adjourn till one o'clock p. m. in order to give the Secretary-Treasurer a chance to prepare a complete statement as to the expenses incurred in the Moyer-Haywood defense campaign. Motion carried. Adjourned at 10 o'clock a. m.

Afternoon Session.

Meeting called to order at 1 o'clock p. m. by President Sherman. All members of the board were present. Before resuming regular order of business it was announced that a committee delegated by the Industrial Council of Chicago wished to be heard on an important matter. Committee was admitted, consisting of J. McSweeney, and John Hammond. Delegate McSweeney stated that the Industrial Council of Chicago had voted to establish a reading room in Chicago, and that a committee had been appointed to ascertain what financial assistance could be secured from general headquarters for the project. The other committeeman corroborated statements. After committee had withdrawn a discussion ensued on the subject matter.

Motion made by Cronin, seconded by Mahoney:

"That while the Executive Board concurs in the spirit of the report of the committee in matters of establishing a reading room, yet the

General Organization is financially unable to support or to maintain such an institution at this time."

Motion carried.

The expenses incurred in the defense agitation for the imprisoned officers of the Western Federation of Miners, Mining Department of the I. W. W., were taken up for discussion and for settling and determining the exact sum drawn from the general fund of the I. W. W. Every expense account was gone over seriatim and scrutinized. Motion made by Cronin, seconded by Kirkpatrick, "That the amount of \$892.80 as expense incurred in the agitation be drawn from the Moyer-Haywood defense fund and turned into the general fund of the I. W. W."

"That the amount of \$433.06 in that fund on and up to July 14th included be remitted to the headquarters of the Mining Department."

"That the General Secretary-Treasurer be instructed to hereafter settle up every month with the Mining Department the accounts of that defense fund." Motion carried.

The auditors brought up several matters in connection with payment of bills and drawing of vouchers and checks. The general policy of the officers were discussed at length and thoroughly gone over. A motion was made by Kirkpatrick, seconded by McCabe, that vouchers and check-stubs for payment of bills for Cranston, should contain the designation as being paid for "organizing purposes,"—the payments designated as being made "under protest" to be allowed to stand. Motion carried.

Question of placing organizers were then discussed and vouchers gone over until 9 o'clock p. m. when motion to adjourn made by McCabe seconded by Mahoney, carried with all against one vote.

Minutes approved as corrected.

#### MEETING SUNDAY, JULY 15TH.

Meeting was called to order by President Sherman at 10 o'clock a. m. The following members responded to the roll-call: Chas. O. Sherman, President; W. E. Trautmann, Secretary-Treasurer; C. E. Mahoney, in place of Chas. H. Moyer; John Riordan, F. W. Cronin, Chas. G. Kirkpatrick, Frank McCabe.

Minutes of previous day's session were read, corrections noted and approved as corrected.

A communication from the Secretary of the Metal Department was read. Strike relief was asked for three members of that department. After a lengthy discussion a motion was made by Kirkpatrick, seconded by McCabe, that the communication be received and the request contained therein complied with. Motion carried, four members voting in favor, two against the motion.

Mahoney and Cronin wished to be recorded as voting in the negative. Letters from Silk Workers' Unions 176 and 190 were read. A full description of the strike situation was given. L. U. No. 190 also asked for strike relief. A motion was made by Kirkpatrick, seconded by Riordan, to grant to L. U. No. 190 strike support to the amount of \$150.00. Motion carried.

Motion made by McCabe, seconded by Kirkpatrick, that the communication of L. U. No. 17 be received and placed on file. Motion carried.

Communication was received from Industrial Council of Cincinnati, O., serving notice that the marble workers were out on strike for a demand for the nine-hour workday and half of Saturday off.

Moved by Cronin, seconded by Riordan, that the letter be received, contents noted and letter placed on file.

Communication from Albert Ryan, Secretary of the W. F. of M. State Union of Arizona, relative to organizing a voluntary state conference body of the I. W. W. was read. Motion made by Cronin, seconded by

Riordan, to receive the letter and endorse the plan in this particular case. Motion carried.

By-laws of the L. Union of I. W. W. of Colorado Springs, Colo., were read. A motion was made by Kirkpatrick, seconded by Mahoney, to insert in Section 4 of Art. 2 the following words "Under the head of good and welfare of the organization." Motion carried.

Moved by Cronin, seconded by Mahoney, that the by-laws of local Colorado Springs be endorsed as amended. Motion carried.

By-laws of L. U. No. 308 I. W. W. of Great Falls were read and taken up seriatim. Motion made by Kirkpatrick, seconded by McCabe that by-laws be approved as read. Motion carried.

A letter was received from L. U. No. 89, Cleveland, O., relative to conditions in the stogie industry, and asking whether assistance in case of a conflict with the employers would be assured. Secretary stated that he had given recommendations to the union. Moved by Cronin, seconded by Mahoney, that the letter be received and the recommendations of the secretary be adopted. Motion carried.

Matter of convention was taken up for consideration. A motion was made by Kirkpatrick, seconded by McCabe, that the Executive Board set the date of calling the convention on September 10th, 1906.

Amended by Cronin, seconded by Riordan, that the date of September 10th be stricken out and September 17th inserted instead. Amendment was accepted by the movers of the original motion. Amendment was adopted after some discussion.

Cronin moved and seconded by Mahoney that the securing of the hall be left to the best judgment of the resident members of the Executive Board. Motion carried.

C. E. Mahoney made statement relative to the money remittances of the mining department.

Motion made by Cronin, seconded by McCabe, that the general office shall continue to remit 50 per cent of all per capita tax received from the Mining Department of the I. W. W. until September first, 1906. Motion carried.

Motion made by Mahoney, seconded by McCabe, that the President of the I. W. W. be designated business manager of the Industrial Worker. Motion carried.

Matter of finances was taken up. Motion made by Mahoney, seconded by Cronin, that all stamps received for the paper fund be designated as receipts "marked stamps," that these stamps be purchased by a check drawn in favor of the Industrial Worker by the Industrial Workers of the World every month. Motion carried.

Mahoney moved, seconded by Riordan, that the President and Secretary be instructed to arrange for a basis of settlement every month with the Express Companies and the Postoffice by checks. Motion carried.

Motion made by Mahoney, seconded by Cronin, that bank deposits be made at least once each week. Motion carried.

Bonds of President and Secretary-Treasurer were presented and read over. Motion made by Cronin, seconded by Mahoney, that the bonds be accepted and approved, and placed in the hands of Executive Board Member Kirkpatrick for safekeeping, until called for by the Executive Board of the Industrial Workers of the World. Carried unanimously.

Motion to adjourn till 2:40 was made and carried.

#### AFTERNOON SESSION.

All members of the board were present at 2:40 p. m.

Motion made by Mahoney, seconded by Cronin, that the checks be-

tween 955 and 1001 as countersigned by the President be not used, and that the checks be destroyed and so marked on the check stubs.

After some discussion on the motion same was adopted unanimously.

A motion was made by Cronin, seconded by Kirkpatrick that the President be requested to confine his expenses, while on the road in the interest of the organization, to the allowance stipulated by the General Executive Board in the July, 1905, meeting.

Motion carried after considerable discussion.

Matters of the Transportation Department were then taken up for consideration. After a two-hour discussion the following motion was offered by Kirkpatrick, seconded by Riordan, that the Executive Board submit the matter of the transportation department to the coming convention for settlement. Motion carried.

Motion made by Mahoney, seconded by Kirkpatrick, that the Secretary-Treasurer close the books of the organizers on August 1, 1906. Motion carried.

All appointees of organizers by the President were taken up for consideration. Motion made by Cronin, seconded by McCabe, that the board approves of the selection of organizers by the President. Motion carried.

The matter of construing the constitution on the representation of unions and departments at the convention was then taken up. Motion made by Cronin, seconded by Mahoney, "that the constitution defining the representation at the convention implies that International Industrial Departments be represented by delegates from the department proper, and that local unions of such departments can not have direct representation,—that the Secretary-Treasurer be instructed to answer all inquiries accordingly."

Motion carried, four in favor, two against, the motion. Trautmann wished to be recorded as voting against the motion.

Matters of the policy of officers and office duties were then taken up. Motion made by Mahoney, seconded by Cronin, that the request of the President to wit: That John Riordan and Otto Justh be dismissed from employment in the office, be complied with."

Roll call was asked for. Vote: Chas. O. Sherman, yes; W. E. Trautmann, no; C. E. Mahoney, yes; John Riordan, not voting; F. W. Cronin, yes; Chas. G. Kirkpatrick, yes; Frank McCabe, yes.

Motion carried, five in favor, one against, one not voting. The hour of 11 o'clock p. m. having arrived, a motion was made by McCabe, seconded by Cronin, to adjourn till 9 o'clock a. m. July 16th. Motion carried.

#### MONDAY, JULY 16TH.

In convening at 9 o'clock a. m., all members being present, the auditing committee continued auditing and finished its work at 12 o'clock noon.

#### MEETING MONDAY, JULY 16TH, 1906.

The President of the I. W. W. called the meeting to order at 12:30 p. m. The following members responded to roll call: Chas. O. Sherman, W. E. Trautmann, C. E. Mahoney in place of Chas. H. Moyer, John Riordan, F. W. Cronin, Chas. G. Kirkpatrick, Frank McCabe.

The minutes of the session held on July 15th were read. Motion made by Cronin, seconded by Kirkpatrick, that the minutes be approved as corrected.

Report of the auditing committee was read to wit: "We, the auditing committee, composed of the members of the Executive Board not employed in the office, report as follows: We have gone over the books of your Secretary-Treasurer from January 1st to July 1st, and find that

the items and receipts and expenditures as entered in ledger are correct, but, owing to the system employed in the office in handling the funds of the organization, and drawing of checks, we are at this time unable to give a detailed report on the finances of the organization.

C. E. MAHONEY.  
CHAS. G. KIRKPATRICK.  
F. W. CRONIN.  
FRANK McCABE.

Matter was taken up for consideration. As it was impossible to strike a balance, on account of three different accounts being kept, it was suggested by John Riordan that expert accountants be engaged by the resident members of the General Executive Board.

Secretary-Treasurer Trautmann objected against the Secretary-Treasurer and President being a party to engaging such expert accountants.

Motion made by Cronin, seconded by Mahoney, that the resident members of the Executive Board, with the exception of the President and Secretary-Treasurer, secure the services of an expert accountant to go over the accounts of the organization, and render a report to the entire Executive Board. Motion carried.

The matter of compensation for the Executive Board members was taken up for consideration. Motion made by Mahoney, seconded by McCabe, that the compensation for Executive Board members be stipulated at \$5 per day, and that the outside members receive the same expense compensation as the President when traveling in the interest of the organization. The motion carried, four voting yes and two voting no. John Riordan and W. E. Trautmann wished to be recorded as voting against the motion. No further business being before the board, meeting adjourned at 2 o'clock p. m.

WM. E. TRAUTMANN, Secretary.

#### SESSION OF GENERAL EXECUTIVE BOARD, TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 11TH, 1906.

President Sherman called session to order at 9:20 a. m. The following members answered to the roll call: Chas. O. Sherman, W. E. Trautmann, C. E. Mahoney, John Riordan, F. W. Cronin, Chas. G. Kirkpatrick, Frank McCabe.

Minutes of the session held Monday, July 16th, were read. One correction made. Moved by John Riordan, seconded by Kirkpatrick, that the minutes be approved as corrected. Motion carried.

The committee which was instructed to engage expert accountants, in compliance with action taken at the last day's session of the General Executive Board, reported that they had engaged the services of an accounting company, and the accounts and financial conditions of the organization had been examined. A lengthy report with recommendations was read. Motion made by Mahoney that the Board adjourn to give the Secretary time to look up missing checks and stubs. Carried. Board adjourned at 12 o'clock noon.

#### Afternoon Session.

Meeting called to order at 2 o'clock p. m. All present.

Motion made by Cronin, seconded by McCabe, that arrangements be made with the accountant so that he may appear before the Executive Board when most convenient. Carried.

Motion made by Mahoney, seconded by Kirkpatrick, that the Executive Board designate the standing of the various unions and departments, and figure up the possible representation each would be entitled to at the convention. Carried. Adjournment taken at 5:30 p. m.

Executive Session, Wednesday, September 12th, 1906.

Board convened at 9 o'clock a. m. All members were present. The work of determining the standing of local unions and departments, and the representation each would be entitled to the convention was continued.

The expert accountant appeared at 10:30, and the report and recommendations were gone over. Upon receiving information on some points, the expert accountant was requested to continue the work of revising his statement the next day at 3 o'clock p. m. Board adjourned at 12 o'clock.

Afternoon Session.

The entire board reconvened at 1:30, and continued to work on the tabulation of local unions and their representation. Adjournment taken at 5:30.

Thursday, September 13th, 1906.

President Sherman called Board to order at 9 o'clock. The following members responded to the roll call. Chas. O. Sherman, Wm. E. Trautmann, C. G. Kirkpatrick, F. M. McCabe, F. W. Cronin, C. E. Mahoney (in place of Chas. H. Moyer), J. Riordan. Minutes of the meeting of September 11th were read. Moved by Mahoney, seconded by Kirkpatrick, that the minutes be approved as read. Motion carried. Letter of protest was read from Shoemakers' Union No. 90 of St. Louis, Mo., relative to moneys collected at the Debs' demonstration meeting. After considerable discussion and explanation, a motion was made by Cronin and seconded by Mahoney, that the full amount of \$106.00 collected at the demonstration meeting in St. Louis be used for the purpose it was collected for, and that the General Executive Board of the Industrial Workers of the World holds the Industrial Council of St. Louis responsible for the return of \$50.00 advanced for the arrangements of that demonstration. Motion carried. The constitution of Local No. 258 of Rhyolite, Nevada, was taken up for consideration. A motion was made by Riordan, and seconded by Mahoney that the constitution be placed on file, to be taken up for consideration at the next session of the Executive Board of the Industrial Workers of the World after the convention. Motion carried. A letter was read from Local Union No. 306 of Reno, Nevada, about conditions in that district. A motion was made by Riordan, and seconded by Mahoney, that the union be informed that the Executive Board members of the Industrial Workers of the World will confer with the delegates from that part of the country, and map out plans for the protection of the membership of the Industrial Workers of the World. Motion carried. A circular letter sent out by a committee of the Window Washers' Union No. 299 of Chicago was read. Considerable discussion ensued on the cause and the current events during that strike. A committee of the Window Washers' Union asked for the permission to be heard. Committee of four appeared, and gave a description of the strike situation, and asked for financial support. The hour of 12 o'clock having arrived, adjournment was taken.

Afternoon Session.

Board reconvened at 1:30 p. m. The expert accountant being present, the financial affairs of the organization were gone over until 5:30 p. m. Board adjourned at 5:30 p. m.

SESSION FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 14TH, 1906.

Board convened at 9 o'clock a. m. All members were present. The members continued to tabulate the standing of the unions and the number of votes delegates would be entitled to. Meeting adjourned at 12 o'clock noon.

## Afternoon Session.

President Sherman called meeting to order at 1:30 p. m. The following members responded to the roll call: Chas. O. Sherman, President; W. E. Trautmann, Secretary; C. E. Mahoney (in place of Chas. H. Moyer), John Riordan, F. W. Cronin, Chas. G. Kirkpatrick, Frank McCabe. Minutes of previous meeting were read. A slight correction was made. Moved by Kirkpatrick, seconded by Riordan, that the minutes be approved as corrected. Motion carried.

A discussion ensued on the merits of the circular sent out against the protests of the resident members of the General Executive Board by a committee of the Industrial Council of Chicago elected by that body to assist the Window Washers in the conducting of the strike.

A motion was finally offered by Mahoney, seconded by McCabe, "that the charter of the Industrial Council of Chicago be revoked on the grounds that they have superceded their authority as a central body, and ceased to be an subordinate organization of the I. W. W. by ignoring the order of the General Executive Board in sending out a circular letter soliciting funds for the support of the Window Washers' strike, under protest of the General Executive Board."

Amendment was offered by Trautmann, seconded by Riordan, to wit: "That the General Executive Board of the I. W. W. request the Industrial Council of Chicago to discipline the committee elected to conduct the Window Washers' strike of Chicago, for refusal to comply with the request of the General Executive Board warning them against sending out a circular letter soliciting funds for the Window Washers, and that failure to comply with this order should be cause for the revocation of the charter of said Industrial Council."

Amendment was lost, two voting in favor, four against same. The original motion was then carried, four voting in favor, two against said motion.

Letter received from Local Union No. 125 of Denver, Colorado, relative to the endorsement of W. D. Haywood as Governor of Colorado was read. Ruling of the Board was asked for. After considerable discussion a motion was made by Mahoney, seconded by Riordan, to refer the matter to the convention for action. Motion carried.

The committee of the Window Washers' Union No. 299 of Chicago appeared again to state the conditions in connection with the strike. After considerable discussion a motion was made by McCabe, seconded by Kirkpatrick, that the sum of \$169.00 be voted as strike benefit to the Window Washers of Chicago. Motion carried. Cronin wished to be recorded as voting against the motion.

A communication from the Metal Department, addressed to the President of the I. W. W. was read. Request contained therein that the Executive Board take cognizance of the expulsion of Paul Schweinburg from the Executive Board of that Department, subject to a vote of the membership, and that the Executive Board officers of the I. W. W. be guided accordingly.

Motion made by McCabe, seconded by Mahoney, that the letter be received and the request be concurred with. Motion carried. Trautmann wishing to be recorded as voting against the motion.

Letter was received from Metal Department, relative to a member who had been victimized by A. F. of L. labor leaders. Motion made by Cronin, seconded by McCabe, that the matter be referred to the President of the organization. Motion carried.

The Board then discussed the advisability of framing a report to the convention, and adjourned at 5:30 p. m. (Here it was when Trautmann

insisted that the Board must submit a draft for a new constitution as ordered by the first convention of the I. W. W.)

Saturday, September 15th, 1906.

Board convened at 9 o'clock a. m. All members were present. After working out a statement of the indebtedness of the various unions to general headquarters, the Board adjourned at 12 o'clock.

#### Afternoon Session.

At 2 o'clock the President called the session to order. All members were present.

(See minutes of July 15th in reaction on Transportation Dept. referred to Convention).

Saturday, September 15th, 1906.

Meeting called to order by President Sherman. All members present. (Action on telegram to be sent to United Brewery Workers' Convention). Moved by Kirkpatrick, seconded by McCabe, that a telegram be sent to United Brewery Workers' convention in Toronto, Canada. Motion carried.

Minutes of July, 1905, and September special meetings were read on which some discussion took place until 6 p. m., when meeting adjourned to meet Sunday, at 9 a. m.

Sunday Morning, September 16th, 1906.

Meeting of Board called to order by President Sherman. All members present, except Secretary-Treasurer Trautmann, who was making out his report. Acting Secretary continued to read all minutes of the Industrial Workers of the World up to July 16th, and upon motion, minutes were adopted. Various communications were read without action by the Board, and there being no further business, the Board adjourned at 3 o'clock p. m.

WM. E. TRAUTMANN, Secretary.

(Del. Mahoney then took the chair.)

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: You have heard the reading of the minutes of your General Executive Board. What disposition, if any, do you wish to make?

A DELEGATE: I desire to ask Sec. Trautmann this question: Did you, Sec. Trautmann, protest against the payment of the \$500 indebtedness that the A. L. U. foisted on this organization?

SEC. TRAUTMANN: I did not, because the A. L. U. turned over the indebtedness in consideration of the furniture and of the office outfit bought from that organization. The amount of money on hand was kept by John Riordan and turned over to the Industrial Workers of the World to the amount of \$870 somewhat later, after the Executive Board had already adjourned.

DEL. KLEESE: I would like to ask Bro. Trautmann if there were no sessions of the Executive Board between January 12th and 15th.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: The auditing of the books was on the 11th and 12th. It is right here.

DEL. KLEESE: Was there any between the 12th and 15th?

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Friday, Jan. 12; Saturday, Jan. 13; that should be the 13th.

DEL. KLEESE: There was a session, was there?

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Yes, certainly, it was read.

DEL. McMULLEN: Mr. President, I would like to offer a formal motion that the reports just read be accepted and filed for future reference. (Seconded.)



DEL. COX: I would like to ask Bro. Trautmann a question.

(The motion was stated by the Chairman.)

DEL. COX: I would like to ask Sec. Trautmann if he knows anything about a communication from W. D. Haywood coming before the Executive Board?

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Referring to what?

DEL. COX: To the Mining Department, from the Miners of Illinois.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: No.

DEL. COX: I would like to ask Bro. Mahoney if he knows anything about that communication?

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Not that I remember of.

DEL. COX: I would like to ask any of the delegates from the Western Federation of Miners if they ever heard anything about that communication.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Now, I would say to the delegate that there were matters discussed in our board meeting pertaining to some communications that the Secretary had received, and possibly that was one of them.

DEL. COX: I would like to state that the reason I ask is that Haywood requested me to give him the condition in Illinois, and I sent it to him and requested that he bring it before the Executive Board of the I. W. W., and he replied stating that he would do it. Of course he got into jail, and I don't know what became of it.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: The matter of the coal miners was only touched, and without any communication. In the session of Jan. 13 or 12, when the matter of the coal miners was up, it was explained that the Executive Board of the Mining Department has certain rules that cannot be amended or cannot be changed except at a convention. That was relative to a free charter application for the miners, one in Roslyn, organized by Frank Bohn, one in Pittsburg, Kas., and one in Chicopee, Kas., and that no coal miners should be chartered except in compliance with the rules of the Mining Department. That means in dues and charter application of \$25. It requires twenty names on the charter application. But that was the only action taken, that these charters were to be turned over, the charter to be kept in abeyance and no action to be taken on the charter, and no resolution on the charter application, and the union later disbanded, or rather the money demanded to be turned over and the papers sent. And the union in Chicopee, Kas., received a charter from the Mining Department, and the \$10 was sent, and the amount of \$10 for the charter application in Chicopee is still on hand, and I received advice that I should return the charter application. That union was organized by McIntosh. The coal mining affairs are all in the hands of President Charles H. Moyer, president of the Western Federation of Miners, consequently I have not even the addresses of the parties who sent in the charter application.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: In regard to the resolution, there were three questions in Washington; there were two and both chartered.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Yes, they were chartered, but there was a conflict.

DEL. COX: Another matter. There was an appeal as to the conditions in St. Louis and vicinity made to the Executive Board asking for an organizer to be sent to St. Louis and vicinity. What became of that before the board?

SEC. TRAUTMANN: All these communications referring to organizers are referred to the President. Every communication relative

to appointing organizers, as you know from the minutes, was referred to the President of the organization, as he has the sole authority to appoint organizers and discharge them; only in one case, where an organizer was discharged by the action of the board, but no record was taken of that.

DEL. SIMS: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Secretary for information. I have not seen an expense report for the Executive Board meetings in the months of July, August, September, October and November, 1905, and I only see the names appearing of Mahoney, Riordan and Cronin, but not McCabe and Kirkpatrick. I would like information on that.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: As to why there is no expense account of the Executive Board members?

DEL. SIMS: Yes.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: For what Executive Board meetings?

DEL. SIMS: For the months I named.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: There were none. If we have no Executive Board meetings there certainly would be no expense account. You can see by the report that we had only three sessions of the Executive Board, and at two sessions the miners' affairs were responsible for most of the meetings, for half a day or a day, and on these days when they met you will find an expense account. I certainly would be a fool to pay out any money and not charge it up.

DEL. SIMS: Taking the dates that you read in your report of the Executive Board meetings and comparing those dates with the expense report, I see no report of the payment of expenses during that month in the list that you made out.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: You will find during this month the expense account. Take, for instance, the expense for the Executive Board right from the start. The resident members and Cronin of Butte, Montana, attended the first session of the general Executive Board, held immediately after the convention of 1905, but I don't know who paid him. He never charged anything for that at that time. Isn't that correct?

DEL. CRONIN: I never got paid.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Well, you know that you didn't charge anything, nor did Riordan charge for the first general Executive Board session. You will find for those two resident members that the account is given on the expense report. The two resident members, for every session that was held, you will find the accounts recorded on the expenses of the organization.

DEL. HAVER: I rise to a point of order, that we are not going into a debate over this financial report. I believe we are only hearing the report of the Executive Board. I don't think we have any business to go into any discussion on this financial report as yet.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: I will hold that the point is well taken. Delegate Sims, I believe this is a matter that if you wish to discuss it you can take it up on the financial report and discuss it at the proper time.

DEL. GOLDBERG: I would like your attention, Bro. Trautmann; in the report of the Executive Board I notice it was said that a leaflet should be printed about the Capmakers' affair.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: The motion was carried to print the leaflet. Later on it was mutually agreed that the "Industrial Worker" should contain our statement in rebuttal of the statement made by the American Federation of Labor Capmakers, and we thought it was

sufficient at that time, and then other matters came up and we had to send out other circulars, and that was the reason. I virtually had no time to draw up the circular. We were unlucky about it. There were so many circulars to be made out or drawn up that it was impossible.

DEL. GOLDBERG: Then there was some negligence of the cap-makers in Cleveland.

DEL. McMULLEN: I understand him to say there was some negligence of the Executive Board.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: That may be true. I did all I could in sending out letters and statements, but I couldn't send everything alone. While it is true that a circular letter was to be drawn up, before we had an opportunity to make such a circular there came other occurrences. There came this occurrence in the west, in Idaho, and this circular had to be drawn up, publishing all these things, and our office was practically overworked every day.

DEL. FISCHER: I want to ask a question of President Sherman. As I learned from reading the minutes of the January session of the Executive Board, President Sherman was instructed to answer a letter which was sent by Local 130, with reference to the interpretation of an industrial union. Now we did not receive such an answer. I would like to know why we did not receive it.

PRES. SHERMAN: I could not say why you did not receive it. It was mailed to you.

DEL. FISCHER: It did not come.

DEL. ROTKOVITZ: I would like to ask the General Secretary if he is prepared to answer as to who this organization of the I. W. W. owes money to. I would like to ask him who the organization owes.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: We owe absolutely the amount of \$500 to the St. Regis Lumbermen's Union and the organization is not pressing that claim. And we owe \$500 also to the Butte Mill and Smeltermen's Union, advanced to carry on the propaganda in Montana. Then there is a claim that should be taken up by this convention, the claim of the Stogie Workers' Union, when they had the strike and we had to make provision to pay them strike benefits in order to continue their strike. And there was the Silk Workers' strike, and not a single penny in the treasury then, and strike benefits having been promised them, certain provisions were made and some members of the organization advanced sufficient money so as to be able to pay strike benefits for those who were only making \$4 or \$5 a week while they were working. This matter should have the attention of the convention so that proper action can be taken on the claim of the Stogie Workers' Union of Cleveland, Ohio.

DEL. GOLDBERG: How much is that?

SEC. TRAUTMANN: That is reduced now from \$1,000 to \$700 and something. That is all the indebtedness. Now the indebtedness to the printing company is altogether wiped out. The debt is liquidated, and the only debt that the organization has is for buttons and supplies furnished by the Fraternal Supply Company, an amount for which we have goods in double the amount.

DEL. SIMS: Mr. Chairman, you ruled that I was out of order, and I request that you make the same ruling with these delegates.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Your point is well taken, Bro. Sims.

DEL. FITZGERALD: I would like to ask a question of the General Executive Board. In the January meeting, when you introduced a resolution favoring moral and financial assistance to the Russian revolu-

tionists, was the vote of the Executive Board unanimous or not?

SEC. TRAUTMANN: That vote was not unanimous.

DEL. FITZGERALD: That is all.

A DELEGATE: Who voted against it?

DEL. HAVER: I would like to ask the secretary a question. When there is an appeal sent out, has the secretary got to bring it before the Executive Board—when a general appeal is sent out for financial aid throughout the country?

SEC. TRAUTMANN: The general appeal for aid was usually brought up. We have sent out three appeals for funds. The first appeal for the Stogie Workers was with instruction from the general Executive Board. The second appeal was in the case of Haywood Local, Youngstown, Ohio. We received telegrams, and in fact when the president was passing through Denver to the convention, I told him there was going to be a critical state of affairs in Youngstown and there was going to be a bitter fight, a fight to the bitter end with the American Federation of Labor. That appeal was immediately sent out. I said the organization could not afford to deny all strike benefits to those who had been forced out on strike, although only being organized about a week. The third appeal for funds was by the general Executive Board again. That was on request of the Window Washers, when they agreed that this appeal be not made for one particular industry, but that an appeal be made covering all members of various organizations that were engaged in strikes.

DEL. HAVER: That is just what I want to find out. Wasn't there an appeal sent out for the Silk Workers?

SEC. TRAUTMANN: The appeal for the Silk Workers is contained in that general appeal for funds.

DEL. HAVER: This last one?

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Yes.

DEL. FITZGERALD: What I want to know is, nothing has been heard about an appeal sent out, I think about six or seven weeks prior.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Yes.

DEL. FITZGERALD: You have heard nothing of it?

SEC. TRAUTMANN: The appeal is only out about four weeks, and we have received money on that appeal and the money is entered on the books, and from that money we have drawn regular strike benefits already for the Window Washers. Yesterday I asked the representatives of Local 176 of New York about the strike situation. The only thing I get from New York is simply a response that this strike is still on. I do not know how many are on strike. I do not know how the strike is progressing, only in the Glendale affair, when 190 received sums of money and it was simply sent on because that strike was so important that we simply thought we could send our finances to win that strike in Glendale, because I realized that if the strike had been won we would have had peace in the silk industry for five years to come, but the conditions in the industry did not justify this strike of the silk workers. They received as much as we could possibly give. Now, the response from the appeal is coming in. At the same time there is a response coming in to an appeal that was sent out by the committee, but that does not go into the general fund at all. I do not know exactly the amount of money that is coming into other sources than the general office of the I. W. W. for the support of the I. W. W. movement.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: If the delegates would permit the Chair to make a statement, there have been several points of order raised by delegates as to the legality of the discussion that is carried on at this time, and the Chair has ruled that the points were well taken at all times. The property of the body at this time is in the form of a motion that those minutes be filed for future reference. That means that any delegate who wishes can refer to any portion of those and segregate any portion he wishes and take it up; but with the motion that is before the house at this time the only discussion that appears to me to be proper is whether or not this is the proceedings of the Executive Board and whether it shall be filed for record.

DEL. McCUE: I believe Delegate McMullen embodied in his motion that the report be concurred in. I think you failed to mention that.

DEL. McMULLEN: You are mistaken, brother. I looked up the law, and the law does not require it. My motion is that the report be accepted and filed.

A DELEGATE: "Received."

DEL. McMULLEN: No, not received, because it is received when it is read. But my motion is that it be accepted and filed for future reference.

DEL. GOLDBERG: A statement was made by Brother Trautmann that at no time—

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The ruling of the Chair has been that you will have to discuss the merits of the motion and then segregate any part that you want.

DEL. GOLDBERG: I want to segregate.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Not at this time till you vote on this motion, unless you amend the motion.

DEL. FISCHER: I ask for unanimous consent.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Is there any objection on the part of any delegate to being recorded as voting in favor of filing this as the minutes of the Executive Board for future reference?

DEL. TULLAR: A question of information.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: If there is any objection we will call the roll.

DEL. TULLAR: There is no objection. I ask for information. I am not clear on the motion. The motion is to file it for record?

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Yes, certainly.

DEL. TULLAR: I concur.

DEL. FISCHER: Unanimous consent.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: If there is no objection on the part of any delegate to being so recorded it will be so recorded. Hearing none, it will be so ordered.

DEL. MARKLEY: I call for the report of the Committee on Rules. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The Chair will state that request was made by the Resolution Committee that resolutions be designated and referred. The Chair stated at that time that if there was no objection on the part of any delegate it would be so recorded and understood. Now that is the next order of business, and I hope the delegates will let us take this order up next.

DEL. SIMS: Mr. Chairman, was it not understood that the financial report would be read before the report on resolutions should be acted on?

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Not that I know of. Brother St. John, will you assist over here as secretary?

DEL. McMULLEN: I believe that Delegate Sims is right; that there is a supplemental report of the financial secretary and treasurer, and that as soon as he would bring it here it was to be read. That certainly was my understanding.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: What?

DEL. McMULLEN: That this financial report of yours would be read as soon as you would bring it in here.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: I will have it tomorrow morning. I have a complete itemized report of the expenses. I have already started work on it.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Now, it is the consensus of opinion that all those resolutions be read, designated and referred?

DEL. RIORDAN: I might say that as a member of the Executive Board I have prepared a report that I wish to read whenever this convention will listen to it. It is just a few words; it will not take me very long.

It was moved and seconded that the convention hear the report.

DEL. RIORDAN: My reason for wanting to read it now is that I have a few recommendations to make here that may be beneficial to the Constitution Committee.

DEL. PARKS: I rise to a point of order. Brother DeLeon made a motion yesterday that the first business this morning should be hearing the reports of the General Executive Board, and I understand that Brother Riordan is a member of the General Executive Board; therefore his report comes now, and any other motion made to supplement or supplant or do away with the force of Brother DeLeon's motion which we adopted as to the order of business for this morning would be out of order, and that Brother Riordan's report is properly before the house.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The Chair is well aware of that fact, Brother Parks, and the Chair was not informed until this time that Delegate Riordan had a report, and the Chair would rule that any member of the Executive Board who has got a report to submit as a member of the Executive Board has the right to submit it at this time, and Delegate Riordan may proceed to read his report.

#### REPORT OF EXECUTIVE BOARD MEMBER RIORDAN.

Delegate Riordan then read his report as a member of the Executive Board, as follows:

To the Delegates of the Second Annual Convention of the Industrial Workers of the World—Comrades and Fellow Workers:

In submitting my report as a member of your Executive Board, I cannot fully cover every detail of the work done, explain the reasons for my actions, nor advance arguments in favor of the suggestions offered without embodying in this report a statement of conditions prevailing in the American Labor Union prior to the dissolution of that organization, when I, prompted by the deepest devotion to my class, cheerfully ceased my duties as the General Secretary-Treasurer of the American Labor Union, and with others commenced to throw all my energy into the work of constructing an organization which I believed would enable the working-class to organize that might, by which battles between the oppressors and the oppressed could be won. To the many members of the late American Labor Union, who had faithfully entrusted me with the duty of taking care of their interests, and who since the formation of the Industrial Workers of the World are as loyally supporting a movement and principles which were so dear to them when they cast their lot with that organization, I also owe this

duty of making them acquainted with my last actions and work before I ceased my work in their behalf and started to act in an official capacity for this organization, which I helped to form and lay the foundation for at the request of the constituency whom I formally served. Great as were the principles upon which the American Labor Union was founded, and superior by far as was the constitution of that organization to that formulated at the first convention of the Industrial Workers of the World, yet it became more apparent daily with every close observer, that the influence of the capitalist-class was becoming predominant in that glorious organization, and that in its policies it was drifting into corruption and compromise. When shortly before the dissolution of the American Labor Union, I at the solicitation of those for whom the protection of the rights of the working-class is supreme duty in life, left homestead and settled conditions, selling house and property accumulated by hard labor to come to Chicago to do what I could to assist in putting out of existence the graft rule prevalent in the American Labor Union, and place the honest and confiding membership into an organization, the formation of which was then already contemplated by the co-workers of the first Industrial Union Conference, and knowing as I did that it no longer had a right to advertise itself as a clean uncorrupted labor organization, the duty towards the working-class movement demanded that I become a participant in an organized effort to save our honest rank and file of the American Labor Union for a labor organization which was to be safe from graft and corruption. This was my sole mission in Chicago; personal gain or consideration was out of question, and the sacrifices made would not be regretted, had I only received the satisfaction that an organization had been formed whose policies were in accord with the sincere and devoted wishes and aspirations of those who know that only an uncorrupted enlightened class of wealth producers will be able to accomplish its emancipation.

Before my duties as General Secretary-Treasurer of the American Labor Union ceased, I realized the fact that the Industrial Workers of the World then formed would have no finances to begin with the organizing of the workers for the onward march against the many enemies.

It was with hard endeavors that I was able to turn over to the officers of the Industrial Workers of the World, apart from the effects of the American Labor Union the cash balance amounting to \$817.59.

Thus with my work done, a duty considered filled to the best interests of those whom I had served up to that time, I was ready to repair back to the mines and mountains whence I came. At this juncture the General President of the Industrial Workers of the World entreated me to remain in Chicago and help the Secretary. I begged to be released, and recommended a man whom I knew to be an earnest worker in the forming of the Industrial Workers of the World, and one who was at that time badly in need of employment. But on mentioning his name, the President became angry. Finally I agreed to remain, and aid in placing the organization on its feet, and put it in good working order, which I did to the best of my ability, working from early morning until late at night, Sundays and all, until the organization was financially able to employ more help, which somewhat lightened my part of the work in the office, although that of the Secretary continued to increase as our organization rapidly grew, and the interested wage-earners from all quarters were seeking information, and asking for literature, so to be able to organize the toilers intelligently under the banner of the Industrial Workers of the World. I mention these facts chiefly for the reason that there may be some delegates present who may think that as a member of the Executive Board I

had sought a berth for myself in this organization, when such had never entered my mind. Those of you who were at the last Convention will perhaps remember, that, were I to have any such thought, I would have joined with those who (at the critical hour) tried to bolt the convention, and at the mention of my name for nomination as a member of the Board was perhaps more surprised than any other delegate in the hall.

I also realize full well that those apparently personal and trivial matters may appear of no special value or importance to this organization, still I feel justified in taking a little of the valuable time of the delegates in order to make my position clear, and my actions understood while serving as a member of the General Executive Board.

I fully realized the responsibility in its connection, and did not at any time forget the expressions of many of the delegates, when after the election of officers the statements were made that while the constitution was far from what it should be, they were willing to place the destiny of the organization in the hands of the Executive Board elected at the Convention, and as far as I am concerned, have never been prompted with other than honest motives in trying to fulfill my obligation, because I had carefully studied the aims and objects and the fundamental principles of the Industrial Workers of the World, it did not take me long in perceiving that my ideas were adverse and not in harmony with those of the majority of the Board; a fact which I tried my best to overcome, which I considered to be a duty towards the entire membership of the organization. I have, therefore, no apology to offer because of the opinions held and fought for, and I can safely leave it to this convention to decide whether I was prompted in my actions by the consideration how to best advance the movement and protect the interests of the organization. While performing my duties as an employe in the office as best I could, and apparently to the satisfaction of the General Secretary, yet the nature of my employment would in no way influence me in the discharge of my duties as a member of the Executive Board, therefore, my discharge from employment in the office by an autocrat whose ill-will I had gained on account of the faithful performance of my duties as a member of the Executive Board should serve as an object lesson to the membership of this organization not to place all power in the hands of one or a few individuals who, carried away with the applause of the masses, become drunk with power and self-esteem, and lose sight of the fact that their place should be considered a gift of confidence of the entire membership, and they appear to have only one thing in mind, that is to suppress any opposition that would endanger the perpetuation of their self-imposed superiority over the common herd. During my term as a member of the Executive Board and my employment in the general office where I was in a position to observe the turn of events, I became more than ever convinced that my fear of autocracy in our movement was well grounded, and on the experience gained my suggestions of remedying the evils are offered for the best interests of the rank and file comprising this organization whose collective will should always be guarded as the supreme power governing the affairs and destiny of our organization. First, as a member of the Executive Board, I thought I was justified in entering several protests against the employment as organizers and the payment of extravagant bills to individuals who were only a detriment to our organization, and their actions a menace, which was later proven, and my propositions herein submitted are based on the experience acquired while observing the conduct of affairs of the organization within the past period between the first and second convention.



Taking the first sentence of the preamble of the Industrial Workers of the World, which reads: "The working-class and the employing-class have nothing in common," and second, our motto which proclaims "Labor is entitled to all it produces." I recommend that before nominating and electing any member to an office in the Industrial Workers of the World, or officers of local unions, or any position within our organization, no matter how simple it may appear, great care be taken that the candidate thoroughly understands and absolutely believes in the above two sentences.

Section 2 (a) of our constitution provides for thirteen departments. I recommend that this number of departments be decreased for the reason that the more departments and sub-departments we have in our organization, the more factional fights and jurisdiction squabbles will arise.

I further recommend that no department be organized and chartered by the Industrial Workers of the World, unless the local unions which would comprise such department have, and are paying a per-capita tax on a membership of at least ten thousand.

I also recommend that all rituals, signs, grips, and passwords, borrowed from pure and simpledom, be abolished.

I also recommend that the office of President be abolished, and that a local executive board without salary be elected, whose duty it will be to meet weekly, and oftener if necessary, to pass on all bills before payment, and assist the secretary in outlining the organization work requiring immediate attention; such local executive board to be subordinate to the general executive board.

I further recommend that a stenographic report of the deliberations of the local executive board be taken, and together with the monthly financial report be submitted monthly to the general executive board and to all local unions.

I also recommend the closing of the accounts semi-annually, that an expert accountant be employed by the local executive board to audit the books of the organization, and a report of findings submitted to all local unions and the general executive board. I further recommend that should the local executive board think it necessary to call a semi-annual meeting of the general executive board, they be empowered to do so and a stenographic report be taken of all sessions of the general executive board and submitted to the convention of the Industrial Workers of the World.

JOHN RIORDAN.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: If there is no objection Executive Board Member Riordan's report will take the same mode of procedure as the general report and be filed for record. Is that what you want done with it, Brother Riordan?

DEL. RIORDAN: I don't care what you do. It is up to the convention to make the disposition they wish to.

DEL. PETRIELLA: The brother has told us how he was employed in the national office of the organization, but if I understood right he has not told us how he came to get out of the national office. Now if it is possible I would like to know that, and I would like to know this other thing: He has stated that he entered certain protests in the Executive Board against the employment of certain individuals who were employed as organizers. I would like to know whether Brother Riordan can give the name of one of such individuals and state the amount of money he received and the service which he gave.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Do you ask that of the Brother? Is that a question?

DEL. PETRIELLA: Yes.

DEL. RIORDAN: Do you ask it of me?

DEL. PETRIELLA: Yes.

DEL. RIORDAN: The first protest that I remember making against any organizer was against Cranston of Chicago, who had been acting as general booster here and has been threatening to throw any of us out who became boisterous. He is the first, I believe, that I objected to. The second I objected to was a bill from the former president of the American Labor Union, Daniel McDonald, who was organizer in Montana. The third I protested against was—

DEL. SIMS: How much was that bill?

DEL. McCABE: I rise to a point of order. Brother Cranston is not in the house, and in all justice to the delegate, if this Brother Riordan wants to criticise anything let him do so, but I say in justice to Brother Cranston, who is not here to defend himself, that Brother Cranston is not on trial.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The point is not well taken, for the reason that mention was made of this fact in Executive Board Member Riordan's report, and he was asked to name the cases that he protested against. I would take it that it is no more than right that he name the different payments that were made wherein he entered protest.

DEL. McMULLEN: Will you not give the amount that Daniel McDonald got?

DEL. RIORDAN: I will not.

DEL. McCABE: I will not take advantage of the Chair at this time and call for an appeal—the same procedure that has been taken.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: That is your right; that is your right.

DEL. McCABE: I will not do it.

DEL. RIORDAN: I might say for the benefit of the delegate over here (indicating Delegate McCabe) that I will repeat at any time after Cranston comes here, or call on him at his house and tell him that I made this protest.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: You may proceed, Brother Riordan.

DEL. RIORDAN: The third man whom I protested against—

DEL. McMULLEN: No, about the second man, Daniel McDonald; what was the exorbitant amount he received, if you can give that.

DEL. RIORDAN: \$59.25.

DEL. PARKS: Was that for a week or month?

DEL. McMULLEN: For what service?

DEL. RIORDAN: He was supposed to be organizing for the I. W. W.

DEL. McMULLEN: For how long, Brother Riordan, what length of time?

DEL. RIORDAN: I will read his bill. Will that do?

DEL. McMULLEN: Yes.

Delegate Riordan read the following bill:

"Paid under protest by Wm. E. Trautmann, and so recorded."

Butte, Mont., Jan. 25, 1906.

I. W. W. Dr. to Daniel McDonald.

Oct. 29.	To Headquarters camp, 40 miles up Big Blackfoot River.	.....
Oct. 30.	Bornes to Missoula (stage)	.....\$ .50
Oct. 30.	Missoula to Butte (night)	..... 3.75
Nov. 10.	Butte to Bornes	..... 3.50
Nov. 11.	Bornes to Missoula (stage)	..... .50
Nov. 12.	Missoula to Butte	..... 3.75
Nov. 18.	Butte to Bornes	..... 3.50

Nov. 19. Bormes to Headquarters camp .....	.....
Nov. 20. Missoula to Butte .....	3.75
Salary, 8 days, \$5 per day .....	40.00
Hotel expense .....	20.00

---

\$79.25

DANIEL McDONALD.

DEL. VEAL: I desire to ask the delegate a question. Which one of the board members was it who voted against the moral and financial support of the Russian revolutionists?

DEL. FOX: Let him finish naming those.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The Chair will rule that the question is not proper, but the delegate may withhold it till he gets through with this question.

DEL. RIORDAN: I think the question was that I should mention some one against whom I protested.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: You are right.

Del. Sims rose, but there were cries of "Sit down."

DEL. SIMS: In connection with the McDonald affair, I would like to ask the delegate was there any one else on the Executive Board who protested against this \$74 or \$79 proposition with the exception of yourself?

DEL. RIORDAN: Yes.

DEL. SIMS: Who was it?

DEL. RIORDAN: The General Secretary, William E. Trautmann.

DEL. SIMS: Is that all?

DEL. CRONIN: Let me ask a question. Bro. Riordan, I believe the impression is out now that that matter came before the board. I want you to state if all members of the board were in a position to protest or knew anything about it.

DEL. RIORDAN: You want to find out from me whether all the members of the board were in a position to make the same objection?

DEL. CRONIN: The same protest, yes.

DEL. RIORDAN: I believe not; no.

DEL. CRONIN: It did not come before the General Executive Board, did it?

DEL. RIORDAN: Yes, this protest against McDonald.

DEL. CRONIN: The protest. But the bill?

DEL. RIORDAN: It came before the General Executive Board.

DEL. CRONIN: But the bill?

DEL. VEAL: Under that head I want to ask the delegate what position he and Sherman took when Trautmann protested. What did he say in regard to the matter?

DEL. McMULLEN: Mr. Chairman, a question of privilege. Now, we have got Del. Riordan here to answer the delegate over here, Petriella, and I wish the delegates would keep their seats until he finishes with the answers, and then ask him your questions.

DEL. McINTOSH: You are right.

DEL. McMULLEN: He has a right to be heard.

DEL. RIORDAN: The third man whom I protested against as an organizer for the I. W. W. was A. B. Anderson, of Spokane, Wash. I did these things for this reason: My past experience in the American Labor Union was sufficient evidence for me to enter such protest. Had I not been in a position to know that they were not fit men to represent this organization as organizers, I would not have entered

such protest. But in entering my protest against Anderson I did so through the general secretary, when I found that he was about to get a commission as an organizer; our president was not in Chicago at that time.

DEL. PARKS: May I ask a question as to A. B. Anderson? I happen to know something about him.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Wait till he answers the brother's question over here.

DEL. RIORDAN: Those three men are all that I can recall now as entering any protest against as organizers. I do not know that there were any others that I entered any protest against. I have never met Anderson. I do not know the man personally at all, only that I know that he was unfair and not honest in his transactions with the American Labor Union, and for that reason I entered my protest against him. I entered my protest for the same reason against Cranston. I entered my protest against Daniel McDonald because I thought that he was a detriment rather than a benefit to our organization, which we later on proved, when he called a convention, right in this city. The convention that was called of the Lumbermen at Missoula, Mont., was called through the instigation of Daniel McDonald.

A DELEGATE: What was the object of that convention?

DEL. RIORDAN: The object of that convention, according to a circular that was sent out to the Lumbermen's Union that had formerly been connected with the American Labor Union, was to form an International Lumbermen's Union.

DEL. RYAN: Was he an organizer of the Industrial Workers of the World at that time?

DEL. RIORDAN: Yes.

DEL. PETRIELLA: I asked the delegate if he knows why he was dismissed, and who dismissed him; if he knows the man who dismissed him and withdrew him from the employ of the Industrial Workers of the World.

DEL. RIORDAN: I think that is another question entirely. That is not the question that the delegate put to me at all.

A DELEGATE: That was the first one he asked you.

DEL. RIORDAN: The minutes of the meeting show. I don't like to bring my personality into this convention or my discharge or anything of the kind.

A DELEGATE: What was the reason you were discharged? We will get the record to show why you were discharged.

DEL. RIORDAN: I asked the president why I was discharged, and the reason he gave me was this, that I had too much influence over the general secretary-treasurer, and when the general secretary-treasurer wanted to consult any one on any important question he would come to me instead of going to the president.

DEL. PETRIELLA: Is that so?

DEL. RIORDAN (to Sherman). Isn't that right?

PRES. SHERMAN: In a sense.

DEL. PARKS: In connection with Anderson and McDonald, I want to ask you if Anderson had any support on the Executive Board or general administration?

DEL. RIORDAN: Yes.

DEL. PARKS: Who supported him?

DEL. RIORDAN: The Industrial Workers of the World, the general organization?

DEL. PARKS: Did this general organization send him a letter authorizing him to do any organization work in the city of Spokane?

DEL. RIORDAN: I believe they did. I think he afterwards organized what was known as the Hod Carriers or the Cement Workers.

DEL. PARKS: Did he have special permission to organize Cement Workers 183 of Spokane, Wash.?

DEL. RIORDAN: I do not know the nature of the commission he carried at the time he organized that union.

DEL. PARKS: Was this commission issued by Charles O. Sherman?

DEL. RIORDAN: Certainly it was issued by Charles O. Sherman, but I suppose it was because he had issued all organizers' commissions.

DEL. PARKS: I want to state that I know something about this. Mr. A. B. Anderson told me personally, and he said that he would debate it with me—that he could show me such a letter as would put the I. W. W. clear out of business in the Western country, and that he had a letter from the Chicago office authorizing him to organize unions and to do lots of irregular things that were not in accord with union principles. Now, regarding Daniel McDonald, I want to state that I read a circular letter written by Daniel McDonald to the Lead union, which letter is now in the possession of a man whose address is in the Big Ben country, which proposed a federation of the national Lumbermen's Union, which was issued by the Plains, Mont., union, I believe. This letter was written by Daniel McDonald to a former member of the American Labor Union, and I believe I am safe in saying—I know at one time I met McDonald in Spokane, and he had been this summer making a special trip out to see this man in the Big Ben country; and I make this statement in confirmation of the fact that McDonald was back of this National Lumbermen's Union that was supposed to be launched on the 4th of June in the city of Missoula, Mont.

DEL. RYAN: All that you have stated there is that some person had heard from Daniel McDonald, but you have not given us any inkling up to this time as to what the contents of the letter are.

DEL. PARKS: The contents of the letter were looking to the purpose of organizing the lumbermen into a National Lumberman's Union, not connected with the I. W. W. or anything of the kind. Then there was a call that succeeded that, that came from the Plains union—I believe Plains, Mont.—printed copies of which are in the possession at the present time of M. P. Haggerty, of Butte City, Mont., if you need to get them.

PRES. SHERMAN: I think we have got one in the office.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: I have the original letter of McDonald in my possession, signed by Daniel McDonald. I will produce it this afternoon if called for.

DEL. HESLEWOOD: Bro. Riordan stated here that he opposed and protested against hiring Cranston on the ground of dishonesty. I would like to ask him if he has any proof that the man has been dishonest since he has been in the Industrial Workers of the World as organizer.

DEL. RIORDAN: My protest against Cranston was that I found out when I became secretary-treasurer of the American Labor Union that he was collecting a per capita tax from the various local unions in Chicago and bringing it in to headquarters and receiving for bringing this in 40 per cent. of a rebate.

DEL. HESLEWOOD: Rockefeller.

DEL. RIORDAN: He would bring in a report or couple of reports and get me to make them out, giving a statement of the number of

the local, the amount of membership, amount paid, etc., and he asked me to make that out. And I asked him what he was getting the remittance of 40 per cent. for? He said it was an arrangement or an agreement that he had entered into with Daniel McDonald, then president of the American Labor Union. And I asked him what he did in the way of organizing, and he said he was continually rustling for those different locals. I afterward inquired from some members of those different locals what Cranston did in the way of organizing. They told me that he did nothing more than any other member of their unions. Sometimes he would act as chairman, sometimes as recording secretary, etc. Well, I asked them if they were aware of the fact that he was receiving 40 per cent. of the tax from their union for the purpose of organizing. They said no, that was the first they had heard of it. It was the same with the other unions. I inquired of members of the other unions whether he was doing anything in the way of organizing. They told me no, nothing more than any one else, and they also were surprised to know that he was getting the 40 per cent. The next time Cranston came and paid over his money I told him I thought that was a graft, and that it would have to be cut off now. Well, he said it was an arrangement or an agreement that he had had with Daniel McDonald, who had been president of the American Labor Union, and Clarence Smith. Well, I said Daniel McDonald is no longer president and Clarence Smith is no longer secretary, so that the agreement will have to be cut off now; that I would not recognize any such agreement, and I understood he was not doing anything any more than any other member of the organization; and I paid him at that time, but I told him from that time I would not pay him any more; that if that was the agreement he had had with him that he would be paid up to that time, but that I would have to consider the agreement off from that time on, and I refused to pay him any longer. His relation to the I. W. W. is much along the same line. The Window Washers of Chicago who are now on strike had been in the habit of giving Cranston their money to bring in to the head office and buy stamps for them. He in return would get a check for 40 per cent. of the amount. The secretary-treasurer was asked to address a meeting of the Window Washers at which Cranston attended, and at that meeting the question came out about Cranston buying the stamps. They concluded that hereafter they would buy their own stamps; that he was doing no organizing for them, and that if there was 40 per cent. of money to be paid back to that organization they wanted it to use for organization, and not to give it to Cranston. Is that right?

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Yes.

DEL. MOTHERWELL: Mr. Chairman, it is half past 12 now. What are we going to do about this matter? I don't want to make a motion to adjourn or anything of that kind.

DEL. KOHL: I want to ask Bro. Riordan, is it customary for the report of the Executive Board to be sent out to the locals?

DEL. RIORDAN: In answer to Del. Kohl I will say that it has not been the custom for the Executive Board to send out—do you mean the minutes of the Executive Board Sessions?

DEL. KOHL: Yes, the minutes or proceedings of the board.

DEL. RIORDAN: No, it has not been the habit or practice to do so.

DEL. KOHL: I was at a meeting when I understood the minutes of one meeting were sent out to a local, and I heard it read, and I understood it came from Bro. Riordan; and also letters from those minutes; that is the reason I ask the question.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: What meeting is it?

DEL. KOHL: At a meeting at Englewood, Chicago, called No. 1 Transportation Department. President Fitzgerald said, I understood, it came from Bro. Riordan.

DEL. RIORDAN: I may have given them my minutes. I don't remember the transaction. I may have given them my minutes if they wanted to know what action the Executive Board took in regard to this union.

DEL. KOHL: Didn't you certify those minutes?

DEL. RIORDAN: I am not sure about that, but it is quite possible I did. I hope I did if I did not.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: I may explain that. I notified the contesting parties of the action of the Executive Board, which was my duty, and anybody who has any business to do with the General Executive Board can have the full information of the action taken. We have no star chamber proceedings in the I. W. W.

DEL. FITZGERALD: There is a point I wish to make. I deny his assertion that I said that Bro. Riordan gave me that report. I want it to go on record here that I went into that office asking what was done in the conference in January, and one of those reports of the proceedings was on the desk of the general secretary-treasurer, and he says, "You can read this, that portion of it," but he says "you must not take it from this office, because it is the only copy I have."

SEC. TRAUTMANN: It is the only copy I have.

DEL. FITZGERALD: And I absolutely deny that I stole it from them, because they said it was the only copy they had.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Did you return it?

DEL. FITZGERALD: I did.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Did you return the copy to me? It must have been left on my desk.

DEL. FITZGERALD: I put it back where I found it when I had all the use I wanted of it.

DEL. CRONIN: Mr. Chairman, the question has been asked, What member of the General Executive Board voted against the resolution pertaining to the revolutionists in Russia? Was that a question of yours, Veal?

DEL. VEAL: Yes.

DEL. CRONIN: All right. I want to say that I am that Executive Board member. My name is Cronin, F. W. Cronin, from Butte, Mont. I want to say to this convention that a great attempt is being made to besmirch my character, to impugn my motives, and no reason given for it. When the resolution was brought before the General Executive Board I asked of the reader, who was Bro. Trautmann, "Is this revolutionary organization considered a political organization?" He said yes, and when it came up I voted against the resolution. I had taken an obligation to this organization which I claim to live up to. I have read the constitution. I may not understand the Preamble as well as a lot of you men, but I want to say if all the actions of men are going to be attacked—now, this has been my public property for months. I heard of it in my own town months ago, that I voted against the revolutionists in Russia, when the facts show that I was a voluntary contributor in their defense. They have been trying to besmirch my charter and impugn my motives of men that have been working in the interest of revolution. It is an attempt to bring it before the organization without any good reason. I want to go on record. The Preamble says this organization is to be affiliated with no

political party, and in interpreting that part of the Preamble I say that I as a member of the Executive Board had no right to endorse the actions of any political body. I hope that that explanation will satisfy them. I would say to those who desire to besmirch the character of members of the organization, I would sooner they would proceed against me, because it would enhance my standing with honest men.

DEL. LINGENFELTER: It is time for dinner. Can't we adjourn?

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: It is long since past the dinner hour. If there is no objection—

DEL. KLEESE: A point of information, Bro. President.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: All right.

DEL. KLEESE: I would like to ask, as a point of information of Bro. Cronin—

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: You can do that after dinner.

Adjourned at 12:45 until 2 o'clock P. M., Sept. 25.

#### AFTERNOON SESSION.—SEPT 25.

President Sherman called the convention to order at 2 o'clock P. M.

THE CHAIRMAN: I believe that at the adjournment Bro. Riordan's report was under discussion.

DEL. KLEESE: I would like to ask Bro. Riordan a question, if it is not too late.

THE CHAIRMAN: Bro. Riordan, will you answer a question?

DEL. RIORDAN: What question?

DEL. KLEESE: I understand that at the time Bro. Riordan was fired out of the office, there was another man fired out of the office, and I understand he was a member of the Industrial Workers, and that another man was submitted in his place who was not a member of an industrial union. Can you give any light on that?

DEL. RIORDAN: This was the information given, which I believe is correct: The man who was fired out of the office as an assistant was a member of the Industrial Workers of the World in good standing, and there was a non-union man put in his place.

DEL. KLEESE: Who had the authority of installing that non-union man in that position?

DEL. RIORDAN: Well, I don't know who employed the non-union man, but I believe it was our president.

DEL. KLEESE: A kind of an "open shop" proposition.

DEL. RIORDAN: Yes.

DEL. SIMS: The question I wanted to ask Del. Riordan before he left the floor was this: Is it not a fact that this McDonald that you have referred to, whose bill you protested against, had a credential as organizer of the Industrial Workers of the World at the time he presented the bill?

DEL. RIORDAN: I think he had. I have no record of those who had credentials or not. I don't know whether he had or not. He was acting, and I think he was recognized as an organizer?

DEL. SIMS: He was recognized as an organizer?

DEL. RIORDAN: I don't know what organization he had credentials out of. He was being paid, though, as an organizer.

DEL. MAHONEY: As a point of information I would like to state for the information of Riordan as well as the delegates, I believe the credentials McDonald had when he went down to that district on his first trip Bro. Moyer gave to him as a member of the Executive Board, and that he had no authority from the general office. The proposition that confronted the organization at this time made it necessary for



some one to go to that district immediately. There were some who wished that I would go to that district at that time, but my time was wholly engaged. There were in the possession of some of us in Butte communications from members of the unions in that district who seemed to recognize McDonald as an able organizer, and it was in that way, believing that he could do some good down there, that Bro. Moyer suggested to him that he go down there immediately, as it was necessary that somebody go at once, and that the matter would afterwards be submitted to Bro. Sherman; and Bro. Moyer took the responsibility of his first trip down there on his own shoulders. Now, as to the last trip that he made there when he was paid under protest, I do not know whether he went with the consent of anybody or not. Of course, if Bro. Sherman afterwards credentialed him he could answer, but on his first going there those were the conditions.

DEL. SIMS: There was no one fixed his salary? Did Bro. Sherman fix his salary?

DEL. MAHONEY: No, he did not, Bro. Sims.

THE CHAIRMAN: Will you take the chair, Bro. Mahoney? I want to make a statement relative to this, to make the proposition clear.

(Del. Mahoney took the chair.)

PRES. SHERMAN: I think it was after the January meeting of the Executive Board, when Bro. Moyer, on his return to Denver, went to Butte, Mont., and from Butte I received a communication from Bro. Moyer stating that owing to the fact that there were several Lumbermen's Unions that had previously been in the A. L. U. and as yet had not affiliated themselves with the Industrial Workers of the World, and as they were very important unions, he felt that they should be looked after. He also stated that he felt that McDonald, being the ex-president or being the president at one time of the A. L. U., and of course organized them or they had been organized under his supervision, he believed he would be the best man to go up there and see what could be done with them; and he stated to me, "I have instructed or taken the authority to send McDonald up into the woods. It may take him ten days and it may take him two weeks. I hope that you will agree with me on this proposition." McDonald started immediately after he told him to go. I do not remember just at this time—the financial report will show, however,—how much was turned in. Any way he made the trip. I am under the impression that it was about eight days that he was gone the first time, and he made out his report as to his finances and sent in his bill, and the bill was paid without any protest, and as far as I was concerned I thought that that ended the controversy on the whole proposition as far as McDonald was concerned.

I think it was about three or four weeks after I received—well, now, I won't say whether I received it or whether the secretary received it, but we received this bill in question, with a statement that he had made a trip up into the woods, and I talked it over with Sec. Trautmann, and we both protested, as far as that is concerned, and we did not pay the bill at that time, and I wrote to McDonald stating to him that I did not understand from Bro. Moyer's communication that he was selected as a steady general organizer, but he was simply to make that one specific trip, which he had done and made out his report and received his check, and I believe we had got his voucher back at that time, and that I could not for the life of me understand why this second bill was rendered, and I wanted him to tell me whether it was

rendered in connection with the first trip, or whether he had made another trip. His statement back was, I believe, to the effect that he had heard from that section of the country, and as he was interested personally in the I. W. W. he felt that somebody should go up there and look after those unions, and he had taken it upon himself personally to go, and he had spent so much time and spent so much money as rendered by the report, and that he believed that the bill should be honored, although if we did not want to pay it he could stand it. I made the report to Bro. Trautmann, and he protested, and I did too personally, from one standpoint. But I says, "As the bill is we will have to pay it. The relations are strained now bad enough in Montana without having somebody going around and saying that they had been out doing work for the organization and they were not given pay for it," and I felt from a business standpoint that I could not afford to have anybody parading around there with a copy of a bill for wages and expenses owed to them and saying that we would not pay it, and I think William, here, will bear me out in that statement, and William says, "Well, I will draw the check under protest." I says, "I have got no objection; in a sense I protest myself, because I claim I did not contract the bill, but he has gone and he has created this bill," and rather than to have these things go out and help that gentleman out there that has been costing us all kinds of money, Fairgrieve, that was in your convention last year, I insisted upon his paying the bill, and he paid the bill, and I am glad he paid it, because this man nor nobody else can say out there in Montana that we are owing anybody for services rendered.

Now that is a full statement of the McDonald affair. He is not a general organizer; he is not on a salary, and I do not think Bro. Moyer stated he agreed to any specific price that would be paid to him. He just simply sent in his bill, and I was not going to question it, the first bill, because it was contracted by Bro. Moyer, and if it was satisfactory to Moyer I would be satisfied with it. I have not seen Bro. Moyer since that time, because he has been incarcerated in prison. We have never had any Executive Board meeting since January that Bro. Moyer sat in. Now that is the explanation of the McDonald affair.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: The McDonald affair is certainly a matter that should have the attention of this convention. It is true that Comrade John Riordan protested immediately as soon as he heard that McDonald had been appointed organizer. We also ascertained that McDonald was to establish headquarters for the I. W. W. in Butte, Mont. By request of the Missoula Union we both together, Sherman and myself, went to St. Louis and attended the debates and mass meetings, and during that time we received a letter from Riordan, who was acting in the office in my place, doing the work in my absence, that he as a member of the Executive Board would certainly protest against paying any further bills to McDonald. Now, the financial report will show that prior to that time we paid McDonald sums as high as \$10 and \$12 a day. I certainly protested, and so did Riordan. Sherman in St. Louis, when I presented to him the letter of Riordan—I have the letter; he says, "I have severed my connection with craft unionism, and I thought that the I. W. W. was going to conduct affairs on strict uncompromising lines." This letter was shown to President Sherman, and he immediately said, "You wire to him that I recall McDonald." Isn't that correct?

PRES. SHERMAN: I think I remember now, but I did not then.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: You said to recall McDonald. Here was a

man that was working in the office fourteen hours a day—no exaggeration. I wired Riordan and said, "McDonald is recalled," and in the City of St. Louis I wrote a special delivery letter that McDonald should immediately cease his services, because for the services rendered we have letters from the Lumbermen's Union in Montana that McDonald was out not to organize but to disorganize the unions that were connected with the American Labor Union.

As a matter of record I wish to state that since McDonald has gone in the lumber camps the unions that had been paying dues to the I. W. W. since McDonald was made organizer ceased to recognize the I. W. W., from the fact alone that McDonald was sent among the lumbermen. I might mention the name of Bernard of Missoula. Parks knows him; you know Bernard?

DEL. PARKS: I don't remember.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: He is secretary.

DEL. PARKS: Of 43?

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Yes. And others; for instance, Potomac; here are letters from these unions protesting against sending out a grafter, and they said in the letters that if McDonald was to be sent out they would not have anything to do with the I. W. W., and he was recalled. I wrote immediately a special delivery letter to McDonald that by instruction from President Sherman his services were no longer required. He ignored that letter, absolutely ignored it, and continued to send in his bills, and at a time when the proprietor of the Joliet Republican Printing Company was threatening to pinch us for not being able to pay the bills for printing; just at that time when we were not able to meet the obligation of manufacturers, manufacturers who were aiming to destroy the I. W. W., and I am going to prove that case too.

I came back from St. Louis and wrote again a letter to McDonald stating that his services were no longer required. He continued, and when he sent in that last bill I certainly protested against paying that bill; no matter who might have appointed him. It is not a matter of consequence who appointed him. The very fact that the man can charge \$8 a day when Fox and others were working for only \$6 and \$5 and \$4 a week and doing more work than McDonald can do in four or five years, was sufficient reason for protesting against that bill. Riordan was the first one to protest against it, and so did I. When Sherman came to me when he returned again broke from St. Louis and Kansas City, and that bill was still hanging, I said, "I will refuse absolutely to pay a graft to a grafter." Well, he says, "The constitution of the I. W. W. gives me the right to tell you that you must pay, and the constitution gives the president the right to command that the bill must be paid," and it was paid on that direction alone and nothing else.

As far as McDonald is concerned, here are original letters of his to me, becoming the property of this convention, proving conclusively that he went around to organize the International Lumbermen's Union. Anybody who knows his handwriting can see.

DEL. KLEESE: I know it.

A DELEGATE: Read that out.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: It is his own signature. Here are letters from the Lumbermen's Union. (Handing letters around.)

DEL. RYAN: At this time I would ask the secretary to read those if the convention wants them, instead of passing them out to the individual delegates.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: I just want to show them to anybody who recognizes McDonald's handwriting. It is his handwriting.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: You need not pass them around; read them.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Well, then, I read the letters referring to the lumbermen out there—

DEL. McCABE: A point of order. What bearing have those letters on this case? Bro. Riordan has protested against them.

(Cries of "Sit down.")

DEL. McCABE: Now, you just tend to your own business. I raise a point of order here, and I want to state the point of order. What bearing have those letters on this case of protest against that check? Now this side of the house, as Comrade DeLeon stated, the majority, want to wash all the dirty linen for somebody else, but when it comes to washing a little linen for themselves they want to quit. Now let us have a fair and impartial trial here and give everybody that wants a chance to have what is coming to them. I ask the Chair to be fair in ruling on this. This is important, and the man's character and reputation are at stake, and I say it is not fair to attack one man's character and shield and hide others. Let us give justice to everybody.

DELEGATES: We have nothing to hide.

A DELEGATE: Get out.

DEL. McCABE: You come over here and put me out, will you?

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Now that has gone far enough, and I don't want any more of it.

DEL. AUGUSTINE: Mr. Chairman, as a delegate on this floor I would like to have all the information there is covering this matter.

DEL. SMITH: I would like to have those letters read. You have already recognized the handwriting of this man, and in justice to that man I ask that those letters be read. I do not want his character injured as the brother over here states, but have those letters read in order to preserve his character.

A DELEGATE: Let them be read.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: I wish to state before I read McDonald's own letter, that he secured the address of all lumber ex-unions organized in the I. W. W.; consequently there are more. He wrote this letter to every one. This is one of the secretary's at Creston City; there was only twenty members then; there are forty members now. (Reading:)

Butte, Mont., Mar. 27, 1906.

Mr. James Brookfield,  
Crescent City, Cal.

Dear Sir and Brother:

I am going to inquire as to how your union is doing, is it still in existence? How are you and it getting along? The reason I ask you this is because there is a movement on foot now in this state and throughout the western country to organize a United Lumber Workers' general organization, to be composed of all men engaged in the lumber industry. Don't you think that it is a good idea to organize all the lumber workers into one general organization? Would your union support a movement of this kind? Would you approve, commend and support it yourself?

This organization to be constructed on lines broad enough and having sufficient scope to meet every essential requirement of the men engaged in the lumber industry, and give to them general support, uniform benefits and the universal respect and protection so woefully needed.

This idea and movement is of interest to all men engaged in cutting or manufacturing of lumber, or the cutting of poles and timber of every kind and character. There is no direct effort being made to organize them now or at any other time, and there are thousands of lumber workers could be reached and organized through and by such organization. And such a movement should get the active support of all lumber unions and union lumbermen. Talk it up and push it. It can be, will be and must be a great organization; all it needs is your voice, your co-operation, your talent and your energy. Will you give it? Certainly you will. Will you attend the convention when it is called shortly?

Let me hear from you about the proposition. I am

Yours, to organize the lumbermen,

DANIEL McDONALD,  
425 E. Park St.,  
Butte, Mont.

DEL. McCABE: I want the date of that letter.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: March 27.

DEL. McCABE: What time was McDonald's commission revoked?

SEC. TRAUTMANN: The commission was revoked later by the president? He didn't recognize my telegram or letter.

DEL. McCABE: I want to ask Secretary Trautmann if Daniel McDonald was a commissioned organizer under salary at the time he tried to organize that Lumberman's Local in that convention. I want him to state yes or no.

DEL. PARKS: You want a libel suit?

DEL. McCABE: Now you just keep quiet. You will have the floor when I get through. You have had it nine days now already.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: I don't know. I don't know when the commission was revoked.

DEL. McCABE: Then I object to proceeding with any further communication until it goes on record before this body whether McDonald was a commissioned organizer receiving a salary from the Industrial Workers of the World at that time. I am not here to defend McDonald any more than anybody else, but in justice to that brother who is absent I insist on the Chairman having the secretary give that information.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: The secretary is not appointing or disqualifying organizers.

DEL. McCABE: Then I object to proceeding any further until we know whether this man was under salary at that time.

DEL. RIORDAN: I have here the telegram (producing telegram).

SEC. TRAUTMANN: The McDonald services stopped Oct. 13.

DEL. McCABE: Oct. 13, what year?

SEC. TRAUTMANN: 1905, by that communication.

DEL. McCABE: 1905; just wait a second. Oct. 13, 1905; that is a long time, ain't it? This was March 27, the correspondence that you are reading?

SEC. TRAUTMANN: I am reading the correspondence just to prove that he is using the last bill which, according to the financial reports, was paid in Denver.

DEL. McCABE: I rise to a point of order, and I will state my point of order. If this man McDonald was commissioned in Oct., 1905, and worked till March 31st, 1906, and after that saw fit to organize another organization, he had a perfect right to do so, as he was not connected with the Industrial Workers of the World at that time, and I

say it is unfair to take that stand against any man; I say it is unfair.

DEL. FOX: Didn't he say he was not in good standing now?

DEL. McCABE: I don't know whether he is in good standing or not. I don't speak of that.

DEL. McMULLEN: He was elected as an alternate from his union to this convention.

DEL. McINTOSH: He must be in good standing.

DEL. McCABE: His local will attend to that affair.

A DELEGATE: He never was in bad standing in his local. In all that time he never was behind in his dues.

DEL. McCABE: I ask for a ruling on that point.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: I want to ask Sec. Trautmann a question, and then I will give my ruling. Are you reading this communication, Sec. Trautmann, to show that those were the acts of McDonald at the time that he was supposed to be in that district as an organizer for the Industrial Workers of the World or are you reading it as a communication that has been sent to local unions of the Industrial Workers of the World?

SEC. TRAUTMANN: I am reading that to draw the inference that while McDonald was drawing a salary from the Industrial Workers of the World he was preparing the ground to organize an International Lumbermen's Union in violation of the constitution of the I. W. W.

DEL. McINTOSH: Now you have got it?

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: What was the date of the last bill that was paid?

SEC. TRAUTMANN: I am just looking it up.

DEL. KLEESE: Page 28 is the one, the 10th of February.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Now the Chair is going to give a ruling on the point that has been raised by Del. McCabe over here. My ruling is that if the secretary is reading the communication for the purpose of proving that McDonald was trying to organize any other organization while he was drawing this salary, the point is well taken. But the Chair is not going to rule that the communication can not be read to this convention. I think it is proper.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Here is your own notice that was sent.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Yes, I will stand for that too. Now I give my ruling, and all the secretary has got to do to straighten the whole thing up is—

DEL. McCABE: That is what I want him to do.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: —is to state whether or not he wishes to infer this as the action of McDonald while he was paid or action on the date that the letter was written. My ruling was, Bro. Secretary, that if you were reading it for the purpose of proving that it was his acts at the time that he drew this money, which was in February, the Chair would rule that it was not rightly appropriated. But the Chair would not take the position and try to rule that those communications cannot be read, because I wrote communications on this matter myself, and I am willing to have them read.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: I have not established the connection between that date and the date that McDonald started to organize the Lumbermen's International Union. I have not established nor have I the evidence to that effect; I only can infer. Consequently I would rather prefer that these communications be read at a later time.

PRES. SHERMAN: Bro. Trautmann, through the permission of the Chair would you let me make one explanation? I am not saying anything to bar this from being read. Will you permit me?

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Yes, certainly; but I have nothing to permit; the Chair has the permission to give.

PRES. SHERMAN: I would state that after this last bill was paid I went to Butte, Mont., and I also went to Missoula, where I engaged the services of one of our members as an organizer to work particularly on the lumbermen, and I think that Bro. Cronin will bear me out in this statement, that this was his specific instruction, to get me, wherever he could find that McDonald had been, all and any data that he could pertaining to McDonald's action, especially when he was there advocating the organizing of this independent union. And this was my reason for doing so, and I explained that to your secretary, that if I could prove that he was out in the interest of organizing this new union at the time that he put in this bill I was going to prefer charges against him in the union of which he was a member, and ask for his expulsion. But up to this date, while our organizer has sent in some letters about the same as this, he has never sent me anything that connects him with the same date that he pretends to be out when he incurred this bill, and if I had it I would expose it. And the night that we had the conference Cronin says, "I have always been a friend of Dan McDonald, but if we can establish the fact that he has sent a bill to our office and at the same time he has been trying to organize a dual union, he is not my friend any longer and I will endorse and sign a complaint to his union and ask for his expulsion." And up to that date I don't know what your secretary has got, although he has made the admission that he has not as yet been able to connect him with the bill in that service. I have tried to get all the data I could, and up to this time I have not connected his time while he had charge of the organization that he was out in the interest of organizing this dual organization. That is all I have to say on that matter.

DEL. PARKS: Mr. Sherman, did you have here anything about Dan McDonald going down to Thompson Falls or in that vicinity in Western Montana as an organizer for the Industrial Workers of the World and taking the charter money and dues to the extent of about \$40 under the guise of organizer for the Industrial Workers of the World, and then never going back with the charter or anything of the kind?

PRES. SHERMAN: No, I never heard of that, but this is what I did hear, and I think I have got it on my desk; that at the same time he was out in the interest of organizing this dual union he made a collection, a voluntary collection, from anybody that was willing to contribute, to the amount of about \$60, I believe, with the understanding that it was for traveling expenses to this supposed convention that was going to be held somewhere there in Montana.

DEL. KLEESE: Plains.

PRES. SHERMAN: At the Plains, Mont. I heard of that, and I have got a list of the contributors in that affair, and our organizer investigated it and verified it by—well, he verified it by a majority of the members whose names were on the list, stating that that was true, that he did collect that money.

DEL. PARKS: When you took the floor here after dinner, you stated that McDonald's first trip out through the lumber regions was as the result of appointment by Bro. Moyer.

PRES. SHERMAN: Yes.

DEL. PARKS: On his western trip in January?

PRES. SHERMAN: Yes.

DEL. PARKS: That is the first?

PRES. SHERMAN: I had forgotten the service he rendered in the fore part of our organization. Now, that came also through the recommendation of Bro. Moyer. McDonald is practically a stranger to me. I never knew him personally until they moved their office to Chicago; I had just heard of him. That was the first time I had ever met him, and I knew very little of his record. But Charlie Moyer thought a great deal of him and spoke of him very highly, and said he had had a big following in the west, and he said to me after our adjournment, when we were grabbing at straws, anything to get somebody into the organization to pay per capita tax to make the organization live—he said to me, “Let McDonald go out, let McDonald go out,” and I consented that he would go to work. I left Chicago myself shortly after the convention adjourned, as the records will show, and he did go to work, and I had forgotten about the incident, but now I remember that while we were in St. Louis a letter came there from Bro. Riordan, and the decision was rendered and the telegram was sent, but I had forgotten that until the bill brought it up here just now, but it comes to me now at this time.

DEL. PARKS: You stated the last time you were in Montana you went to Missoula and put your organizer in the field. Isn’t that organizer the same organizer that Local Missoula 250 had in the field in the month of May of this year?

PRES. SHERMAN: I could not say that.

DEL. PARKS: J. H. Wilburn.

PRES. SHERMAN: J. H. Wilburn, yes.

DEL. PARKS: He is the one my local put in the field in May of this year.

PRES. SHERMAN: Wilburn is there yet.

DEL. SIMS: I want to ask Bro. Sherman, is it true that during the last trip west McDonald acted as the chairman at your meeting in Butte, Mont.?

PRES. SHERMAN: I believe he did. It was a workmen’s union, was it not? It was an industrial union?

DEL. SIMS: Yes.

PRES. SHERMAN: I believe he did. It was an industrial union.

DEL. HAVER: I would like to ask, is it necessary for us to rake up all this history about McDonald? I think we have enough evidence to hang him, and I don’t see why we are going to lose another day on McDonald. If we are going to lose that much time on every one of these organizers, and if every one of the delegates are going to get up and ask questions, these same people that get up are the people that say we are delaying this convention, and I wish to ask the delegates to go on with business and not waste any more time over McDonald or anybody else.

DEL. MARKLEY: Hear, hear.

DEL. MOTHERWELL: In answer to this delegate, as I understand this matter, there has been a disposition on the part of delegates here assembled not to go on with the work of the convention, but to put every man on trial that gets up here, whether he has power or not. The object of all these questions that have been asked by these delegates is for what purpose? To injure the Board of Directors that we have here to do our business, and to show the inefficiency of that Board of Directors; which ain’t right.

DEL. SIMS: I take exception; it is right.

DEL. AHERN: I represent two unions; I am from Local 50. My object at this time is to ask Bro. Sherman the names of the locals that



protested against McDonald as organizer for the Industrial Workers of the World. I would like to get the names and numbers of those unions.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: You ask to be furnished with the names and addresses of the local unions that protested against McDonald?

DEL. AHERN: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The secretary will furnish them.

DEL. AHERN: I understood Bro. Trautmann to say that every lumber union in Montana protested against McDonald having anything to do with the Industrial Workers of the World. I want to get the names and numbers of the locals.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Lumbermen's Union, Potomac.

DEL. McCABE: What is the number?

SEC. TRAUTMANN: I don't know the number.

DEL. McCABE: All right.

PRES. SHERMAN: You can get them in the office.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: And the union which Bonner is secretary of in Missoula. His address is "Rural Free Delivery No. 2." Now, I will read you just one. It was after the Potomac union had withdrawn from the I. W. W. and then was reorganized by Frank Bohn.

DEL. McCABE: What is the number of the local?

SEC. TRAUTMANN: The local is 248. It is:

"W. E. Trautmann: Dear Sir—Yours of April 28th at hand, in regard to the call from Plains, Mont., to organize Lumber Workers in one organization. I tried it, and a meeting of these men turned it down to a man. They don't want anything to do with Daniel McDonald. That was a union that had withdrawn from the I. W. W. prior to this. I received a letter from him stating what a fine thing it would be if the Lumber Workers organized in one union and got some one to look after them, as it looked like they were in bad shape. Last winter before April Frank Bohn organized No. 248, Daniel McDonald spoke in favor of the I. W. W., and A. Fairgrieve had his way. One of the boys requested Daniel McDonald to give an account of the \$5,000 that was short in the treasury of the American Labor Union. So Fairgrieve had it all his way then, in not wishing to take that matter up. I have a few more letters to give you in regard to organizing all the Lumber Workers in the Western mining country in one international industrial department, subordinate to the General Executive Board. Personally I believe it would be a good thing. It would stop a lot of labor graft, that is killing this country."

DEL. McCABE: Is there a seal on that?

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Here is the seal on it, certainly; so you can see it.

DEL. AHERN: I want to ask Bro. Trautmann if there was a local union of the Industrial Workers of the World at Potomac. At the time McDonald was up there in October was there a local union of the Industrial Workers of the World at that time?

SEC. TRAUTMANN: I will have to look into the ledger to find out what time the Lumbermen's Union of that part of the country paid dues to the I. W. W. I will answer that tomorrow morning.

DEL. AHERN: All right.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: I will take a note and I will give you the exact standing of the organization.

DEL. MOSKOVITZ: Mr. Chairman, if I understood, at the time of the report made by Bro. Riordan, all he intended was to bring out recommendations suggested by the experience he has had while a member of the American Labor Union, as well as a member of the Execu-

tive Board of the I. W. W. When he made his recommendations I did not think any of the delegates would wish that he should make his statement more plainly in reference to the particular protests against those men that have been sent out as organizers, and the question that was asked by the delegate at the other side of the hall has simply to bring out the inference and find out why he was protested against those men; not taking into consideration the letters that have been presented to us by Secretary Trautmann; not taking into consideration all these questions. According to the statement made by Bro. Riordan it was that his experience with those men had shown him in the past that they were not the men that were fit to represent the I. W. W. form of organization. What their personal affairs were is not the question, as it was then, but the inference was simply that his experience was such that we ought not to have that man, a man that has been at the head of the American Labor Union, and confining the experience now to where it would be looked into. That is all that should be before us. If we go on with this question longer we will find ourselves in a muddle. There is no necessity that we should go into all the details about this matter. The fact is plain to any man of common sense that by experience with such men in the past we ought to have sufficient proof as to how to act. And if I were in a position now to make a motion I would move that we refer this matter to the incoming Executive Board, they to look after matters of this kind and then take action for future reference.

DEL. ROGERS: I second the motion.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: It has been regularly moved and supported that the recommendations in the report of Bro. Riordan pertaining to this matter be referred to the incoming Executive Board for investigation. You have heard the motion as stated; are you ready for the question? (Question called for.)

DEL. McCABE: Mr. Chairman, as a member of the General Executive Board of the Industrial Workers of the World, I did not intend to make out any kind of a report or any recommendations, but as some of the ex-organizers and delegates here have seen fit to place the members of the General Executive Board on trial, I consider it fair to the members of the Executive Board who have not made any report or any statement that it is up to them to make some kind of a statement, whether typewritten or verbal report, and I am going to ask the Chair and appeal to the delegates here for unanimous consent until I cover some points from the first meeting of the General Executive Board up to the present time.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The matter is before the house now. It becomes the property of the house in the form of a motion to refer it to the incoming Executive Board.

DEL. FOX: Does this motion carry Bro. Riordan's report with it? I understand his report is to take the same course as the others by the previous motion, and I don't wish to send it in any other direction.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: It does not take the same course. Now, understand clearly the position your vote to refer will place this convention in. The Chair stated that if there was no objection Bro. Riordan's report would be printed and distributed among the delegates. Had you consented to this at that time it possibly would have been printed by this time and in the hands of the Constitution Committee, so that they could work. It would also be in your hands. You could segregate any portion of that report that you wanted action on and

you could bring that portion up. It is the understanding on the motion now that while there were objections raised to the other one being recorded, the Chair is of the opinion that the report is still before the assembly as reported and not referred anywhere, as there was objection raised to that mode of procedure, and the motion now is that this portion of the report referring to this matter be referred to the incoming Executive Board for investigation on this point.

DEL. PARKS: Mr. Chairman, I want to talk to the question of referring it to the incoming Executive Board. I say it is wrong to refer this to the incoming Executive Board. I say that this should take the same course as the balance of the report of the General Executive Board and the general officers and be printed. If it goes to the incoming Executive Board it takes it out of our hands and we cannot get it into our hands again and get it before the Constitution Committee without reconsidering the question. I have an understanding that by common consent these reports were all to take the same course; that that was a rule, an implied rule if not a definite rule, laid down to that extent in the way of a motion that these general reports should take the same general course and be printed. Now, if that is correct I will raise the point of order now that the present motion to refer to the incoming Executive Board is out of order, because it does not take notice of that rule. What is the ruling?

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The Chair will rule that the point is not well taken. I will state my reason for the ruling now, Del. Parks.

DEL. PARKS: All right.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: And if you think I am not correct we will have the reporter read the action that was taken and read my recommendation in regard to Bro. Riordan's report. On the report of your General Executive Board being read it was moved by Del. McDonald and seconded by some other delegate—

DEL. McCABE: Del. McMullen, I think.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: — by Del. McMullen, that the report of the General Executive Board be received and placed on file for future reference. At that time I did not know that Executive Board Member Riordan had a report. This motion was carried, however. On his report being read the Chair stated that he was of the opinion that it should take the same course that the report of the General Executive Board did, and that if there were no objections it would be so ordered. There were immediately objections, and a discussion arose at that point that has been going on since, without it ever being properly the property of the house up to the time this motion was made.

DEL. KIRKPATRICK: I rise to make an amendment to the motion, namely: that Bro. Riordan's report be placed on file for future reference.

DEL. McCABE: I second the motion.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: It has been moved as an amendment that Executive Board Member Riordan's report be placed on file for future reference.

DEL. FOX: I move as a substitute for the whole that Bro. Riordan's report be printed and distributed like the report of the General Executive Board among this convention and take the same course. (Seconded.)

DEL. McMULLEN: I rise to a point of order, that there was no motion made to print the General Executive Board's report.

DEL. FOX: I move to substitute that for the whole.

DEL. McMULLEN: Do you want the General Executive Board's report printed, too?

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The Chair is of the opinion that when the delegate moved the substitute that it be printed in the same manner that was ordered for the report of the General Executive Board, there was no disposition made of the report of the General Executive Board as to having it printed. The motion was that it be received and placed on file for future reference.

DEL. FOX: I move then as a substitute that Bro. Riordan's report be printed and distributed among the delegates. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: It has been regularly moved and supported that the report of Executive Board Member Riordan be printed and distributed amongst the delegates. You have heard the motion; are you ready for the question? (Question called for.)

DEL. McMULLEN: Now, here, brothers; if you had printed all the proceedings of the General Executive Board I would readily have concurred in this. But really, besides making recommendations for changes in the constitution based upon his experience, which, in my humble judgment, should go to the Constitution Committee—besides doing that, it is simply his protest against these three men. Now, I want to say this, that when you print a thing and circulate it concerning the character of a man—which is what the protests amount to—you attack his character. One of these men comes from my own locality, Dan McDonald. I know him pretty well. To simply say this is to say the truth; he was chairman of the 5th of August protest meeting, which you all know. He is a man highly respected in a great many things and fairly well thought of. He may have made a great many mistakes, but until he is duly tried and convicted of having done something, I do not think it fair to circulate something under the guise of printing a protest from one member of the Board that would reflect upon his character, and I hope that this organization will take a broader view of this matter and let that part of the member of the Board's report go to the Constitution Committee, where it properly belongs and where they can get some good suggestions out of it, and let the other part simply go on file like you have done with the report of the General Board. I am sincerely opposed to this motion, or rather to this substitute, speaking properly. I am for the reasons I have just spoken of. It does seem to me, in fairness, that these letters which the Secretary-Treasurer attempted to read to you here were as much a justification of McDonald as they were of the General Board and should have been read. They would have injured nobody, and they could have been read two dozen times while these brothers have been kicking about this and that and one thing and another. Judging from the one he read, I don't think they show anything but the feeling of some fellow in the locality where they are addressed from, and rightly so, that they had a right to send him, but brothers, on the pending motion I do hope that you will allow those parts of this report to go to the Constitution Committee, which properly belong there, and the other parts of it I do hope that you will allow to be voted for reference by any member of this organization, whether the present Executive Board, a future Executive Board, or what not.

DEL. MOSKOVITZ: Now, Mr. Chairman, we have a stenographer here, and this appears already in this report of the controversy on this matter, and I will compromise my motion with the consent of the house, with Del. Kirkpatrick's motion, that this matter be placed on file.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: We are not discussing his motion; we are discussing the substitute.

DEL. MOSKOVITZ: I was coming to that, Mr. Chairman. I am opposed to the substitute. I am in favor, with the consent of the house, of having Del. Kirkpatrick's amendment taken into my motion, and in that way we will settle the matter without delaying our affairs.

DEL. AUGUSTINE: Comrade Chairman and comrades, Bro. McMullen is of the opinion that we are liable to a suit for libel. I want to say that there is sufficient evidence in this office, in the office of this organization, to prove that Daniel McDonald is an enemy of the Industrial Workers of the World. Consequently we cannot lose anything. Furthermore, Bro. Riordan's report, mentions no names, and if it is published nobody can take exception to it and sue us for libel. I hold that this report should be printed for the Constitution Committee in order that it may come before them in better form than it now is, and I think that the substitute motion made by Bro. Fox is the proper motion.

DEL. McCABE: Question.

DEL. TULLAR: I take practically the same view. The report of Bro. Riordan mentioned no names, and it does not imply that the communications which the Secretary has read shall be embodied in his report, for they are not. We are taking up his report, and these communications concerning certain individuals to whom exceptions have been taken as organizers are, in my estimation, the property of the incoming Executive Board.

DEL. FORBERG: I move the previous question. (Seconded.)

DEL. McCABE: I had the floor before she moved the previous question.

DEL. McINTOSH: The Chair did not recognize you.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The Chair would rule that you had the floor before the previous question was called for.

DEL. McCABE: Now, in order to answer the statement of the two delegates that have spoken before me in regard to no names being mentioned, this convention will go on record that Daniel McDonald's name has been assailed before this body, and it is public property, I don't care whether Del. Riordan mentioned his name or not. His record and character have been assailed here through correspondence, which is the public property of this organized body and the public at large, and if there is any reporter in this audience here that sees fit to publish that in any press of the daily papers, this organized body and the delegates of the I. W. W. will be held responsible for the actions of this organized body. I take exception to the remarks of those two brothers in regard to the communications. Those communications are the property of this organized body, and you are assembled here to deliberate on matters pertaining to the interests of the I. W. W., so remember that.

Question called for, and previous question called for.

DEL. FORBERG: I move the previous question. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The previous question has been moved.

DEL. McINTOSH: No objections.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: You are voting now on "Shall the previous question be put?"

DEL. ROGERS: No objections.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection on the part of any delegate to being recorded in favor of the motion for the previous ques-

tion? Hearing none, it is so ordered. The Secretary will proceed to call the roll on the substitute of this delegate over here, Del. Fox, which is that the report of Executive Board Member Riordan be printed for distribution amongst the delegates.

DEL. HOLMES: A point of information. Isn't it to be referred to the Constitution Committee?

A DELEGATE: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The Secretary will proceed to call the roll.

The roll was then called, and the result announced as follows: Total vote, 636; yes, 364½; no, 271½.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The substitute is carried.

#### RESOLUTIONS.

DEL. MARKLEY: I move that we now hear the resolutions.

DEL. AUGUSTINE: I rise to request that we now hear the resolutions presented to the Secretary. There is no motion necessary, I believe.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: This was the next order of business provided for, and the resolutions will now be submitted and designated to the proper committees.

DEL. FOX: Do I understand that Riordan's report goes to the Constitution Committee also?

DEL. AUGUSTINE: Yes, sure.

DEL. FOX: That is all I want to know.

DEL. LINGENFELTER: It is understood that these resolutions are to be passed to the different committees without debate?

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Yes.

Asst. Sec. Edwards made a statement as to the method of numbering the resolutions and noting their source.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Just a minute. Let us have an understanding on this. What disposition does this convention wish to make in referring these resolutions? Is it the consensus of opinion here that resolutions pertaining to the constitution be numbered, referred to the Constitution Committee, and so recorded as Resolution No. so-and-so, without being read, and on return of the resolution that the resolution be read with the recommendations of the committee embodied in their report? Or is it the consensus of opinion to have the resolutions first read before referring them?

DEL. TULLAR: Mr. Chairman, I move you that the Secretary keep a tabulated account of those resolutions, with the numbers attached to them, and that the resolutions be referred to the respective committees without reading, and that they be read by the respective committees to this convention before adoption or non-adoption, with the recommendations of the committees, in other words. (Seconded.)

ASST. SEC. EDWARDS: The Secretary desires this recommendation to be made: These resolutions have all been cursorily run over and we know practically to what they refer, although they have not been read yet in detail except by the writers, so far as I know. In the main they relate to the constitution. About that there is no question whatever; probably 95 per cent. of these resolutions go eventually to the Committee on Constitution. The suggestion that the Secretary wished to make to the delegates was that the entire resolutions having been listed and numbered here, be referred to the Committee on Resolutions, the Committee on Resolutions then to sort them out and pass them to the Constitution Committee, so far as they pertain to the work of that

committee, retaining to their own committee those that pertain to them.

DEL. AUGUSTINE: I move that that be the mode of procedure. The Resolution Committee can pass on them, and what they don't need will be passed over to other committees. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: It has been regularly moved and supported that the resolutions be referred to the Resolutions Committee, they to designate the committees that they shall properly come before, and that they refer them to those committees.

DEL. McMULLEN: Now, Mr. Chairman, I understand that Bro. Ryan, as the secretary of that Resolution Committee, brought these in here to the attention of this convention for the very purpose of having them read here and referred to their proper committees by the President. They were once in the hands of the Resolution Committee, and this mode of procedure is to refer them back there and confer power on that committee to refer them to some other committee and keep that part of a resolution which in their judgment pertains to their committee. That is the way I understand the motion that is now before the convention. Isn't that right.

DEL. AUGUSTINE: Mr. Chairman—

DEL. McMULLEN: I believe I have not given up the floor yet.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: You have not. You have the floor.

DEL. McMULLEN: Thank you. I simply want to say this: In view of the fact that the Resolution Committee have sent these here for this purpose, we should read them, and knowing their contents we will know to what committees they have gone and we will know whom to approach to show our reasons before that committee why we were desirous that they should be incorporated into the regulations of this organization. And further than that, it would prevent the introduction of a resolution by some one who does not know that there is a resolution already in containing his idea; it would prevent them from bringing in another resolution of a similar nature. And as these have to be read, and as they furnish really the thought and the food on which we expect to feed this organization in the future, in my humble judgment there is no way to satisfy our minds in thinking of what we are expected to perform other than by having the material on which we are to work presented to us for our ideas prior to the meeting of this Constitution Committee or the other committees to which they may go. If it is done in the manner in which the motion now provides, we will have it read once, and you will have an opportunity at this reading—however superficial it may be—you will have an opportunity to have an idea of what you are about to face when the report finally reaches you. I submit that I never heard of this course of procedure in any other convention than this. I never heard of such a proceeding as this. In my humble way of looking at it it is a means of preventing the dissemination of the full knowledge and the full thought that we desire to become permeated with in order that we might mold them into law so as to influence the organization which we are here representing and be beneficial in the workings of the organization in its world-wide project of organization and education. I say, my brothers, there is but one proper course to pursue, and that is to read these and let the President, having heard the contents, respectively refer them to the committees where they should properly go. I am opposed to the motion as it is now before us.

DEL. AUGUSTINE: Mr. Chairman and delegates, the reason I made the motion was that I thought we might save the time of reading all these resolutions by referring them to this Resolution Committee. These resolutions, I understand, after the Resolution Committee reports on them, must come back here and be read. They can be read again. But if it is the sense of this convention that these resolutions be read, I am quite willing to withdraw my motion and save the time in debate, with the consent of the second.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem.: Is there any objection on the part of the seconder of this motion?

DEL. HOLMES: None at all.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem.: Is there any objection on the part of any delegate that the matter be withdrawn?

DEL. LINGENFELTER: I object to the withdrawing of that motion. It is the property of the house.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem.: It certainly is.

DEL. LINGENFELTER: And I don't wish to spend another two hours on it.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem.: The matter is still before the house. There has been an objection raised.

DEL. FOX: Mr. Chairman, it is generally the custom in parliamentary assemblies to refer every resolution to a Resolution Committee. It is not read first, that is not the custom. But after it comes back it is read if the fellow who put it in desires it to be read or if the assembly desires it to be read.

DEL. HAVER: I don't believe in hurrying everything through. We have spent some time, and let us get down to the resolutions. I believe there are many resolutions in there that have the same questions in them and the same purpose in view, so why should we not hear them and hear the sentiment of the people? It seems to me time has been wasted by the same people that wished to chase things and get through when the most vital questions are up. We have here got some thing that is of real importance, that we don't want to pass over.

DEL. SMITH: Some of the brothers have the very peculiar faculty of repeating the same thing over and over. I was in favor of the motion for the same reason cited by those who were opposing that motion. There are evidently many amongst these resolutions that are very similar, so why should we lose our time reading these resolutions over here? That committee could do that much better and cut out the resolutions that are alike.

DEL. PARKS: Mr. Chairman, we have elected a Committee on Resolutions. What is the function of a Committee on Resolutions? The function of a Committee on Resolutions is to receive the resolutions that are presented, read them over, and if they are not right to reshape them and read them over here, with their report as to what their recommendations are. They may say, "We recommend that this be concurred in; we recommend that this go to the Constitution Committee; we recommend that this go to some other committee." They can say, "We recommend the following," which may be a substitute for the original resolution which has been handed in by somebody else. And then they will read what they recommend as an original resolution, and then the question is before the house, and we take up and discuss what the Committee on Resolutions adopt from time to time. That is what we have a Committee on Resolutions for, for them to take that up and report. We do not need these things read in their crude form before the assembly now. It is going to take



lots of time. I am in favor of the motion to get these into the hands of the Committee on Resolutions and let them agree upon a report, find what their actions are, and then we will act on the report of the Committee on Resolutions.

DEL. McCUE: I would like to ask Comrade Parks a question. Do I understand you to mean that it is the province of the Committee on Resolutions to change the construction of any resolution submitted to it?

DEL. PARKS: They report a resolution that they pass. Then it is their province to report their action upon that resolution. Then it is our province to say what we will do with the recommendation of the Committee on Resolutions. I do not say that it is their province to suppress any resolution. They have got to report the resolution here and report what action they have taken upon that resolution.

DEL. McCUE: But in your statement you said it was within their province to change the construction of a resolution.

DEL. PARKS: Yes.

DEL. McCUE: I contend that it is not.

DEL. PARKS: That is a different proposition.

DEL. MOSKOVITZ: I move the previous question. (Seconded.)

DEL. GOLDBERG: If it is a matter of saving time, then I don't think the chair ought to sustain the motion. Any way, if we read the communications or resolutions at present the Resolution Committee will recognize the consensus of opinion of the entire delegation and they will know how to act upon it, and they will bring in their report accordingly, and then we will have to rehash it over again. But if they are rehashed now we will have the line of work desirable after the recommendation is submitted before the house. I think the Chair should rule for the reading of the communications and have them presented by the Secretary.

DEL. SMITH: The previous question has been asked.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The previous question has been moved by one of the delegates. Is there any delegate on the floor that objects to be recorded in favor of the previous question?

DEL. RYAN: A point of order.

A DELEGATE: What is the question?

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The motion is that the resolutions be referred to the Resolution Committee, and that they go over the resolutions and refer those that belong to the Constitution Committee to that committee. You are now voting as to whether or not the motion shall be put. The previous question being called for, the vote on the previous question is to close the debate.

DEL. RYAN: A point of order. The previous question cannot be discussed?

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: No.

DEL. RYAN: Will you entertain a point of order?

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: I will entertain a point of order.

DEL. RYAN: My point of order is this: I speak for myself as well as a good many delegates on this floor when I say I would like to see the work of this convention hastened. I would like to see the business of the convention facilitated as much as possible, and I want to raise my voice in protest against this gag law. I refer particularly to the delegate over there and this one here (indicating delegates). There is a delegate here who has gone on record four or five times on this floor, and I never knew him to raise anything else but the previous question. Now, I am a member of the Committee on Resolutions, and

as such I feel that it is an injustice to me as well as to other delegates on the floor to deprive me of the opportunity to express my views on this matter. I want to go on record as expressing myself in that way.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The previous question has been called.

DEL. RYAN: All right, I will abide by the action of the convention.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Proceed with the vote. Is there any objection on the part of any delegate to being recorded in favor of the previous question?

DEL. McDONALD: Mr. Chairman—

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Do you object?

DEL. McDONALD: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The secretary will call the roll.

DEL. McDONALD: I want to make a point of order right here.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: If you had stated that you rose to a point of order the chair would have recognized you. You rose and addressed the Chair and the Chair asked you if you objected, and you said yes.

DEL. McDONALD: Now will you allow me to make the point of order?

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Yes, the Chair will allow you to make your point of order.

DEL. McDONALD: The point of order is this, that those resolutions have not become the property of this house until they are read, and they cannot be referred until they are read. That is my point of order. I want a decision on that point.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The Chair is of the opinion that the point is well taken, but the Chair is also of the opinion that this assemblage has got the right to refer any document which may come before it to a committee to submit a report to this assemblage. It is up to this assemblage now to say whether you are going to refer them to a committee and wait to make it the property of this house until the committee reports, or whether or not you are going to read them at this time. Both are in order.

DEL. McDONALD: Is this a question of referring them to the committee or whether they will be read before they are referred?

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: If you place them in the hands of the Committee—

DEL. McDONALD: They come from the committee.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem (continuing):—they do not become the property of the house until that committee reports.

DEL. McDONALD: Well, there is my point of order, right there, that they are not the property of the house until they are read.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The Chair ruled that your point was well taken, so far as that goes, but the Chair also ruled that this assemblage has got the right to place this documentary matter in the hands of a committee—

A DELEGATE: Without being read.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Without being read; but it is not the property of the house in any way until it is reported on by that committee.

DEL. RYAN: I want to raise a point of order. I want to contend that in any event this is unfair to the Chair. We have only three standing committees. I insist that we are not prepared to do the business of this convention until we have several more committees. We should have committees on Strikes, Lockouts and Grievances,

Education and Literature, Organization, etc. Those resolutions should have been read in this convention, if it is going to be a convention or even makes the slightest effort to a semblance of one, and I think it would be unfair to the Chair to deprive him as well as all the delegates that are here of an opportunity to familiarize themselves with the contents of those different communications and resolutions. They should be read by the secretary, the Chair could refer them to all the different committees, and then if there were any objections from any member on the floor, or should the convention as a body so decide, they could determine to what committee those different resolutions should go, when they are not satisfied with the action of the Chair.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: No, Brother Ryan, the previous question has been moved, and the Chair could not entertain anything only a point of order.

DEL. RYAN: Well, I rose to a point of order then.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Yes, but you are discussing the subject matter before the house instead of raising your point of order. Now the Chair wants to be fair with everybody. The brother who moved the previous question and the brother who seconded it are entitled to their contention. The Chair is not as yet clear as to whether or not it is going to require a roll call vote, as the brother who objected claimed it was a point of order he was making. The Chair will again ask if there is any delegate on the floor who objects to being recorded as in favor of putting the previous question.

DELEGATES: No objection.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: It will be so recorded, and the vote will occur now on the previous question, the motion that this matter be referred to the committee without being read, and that the committee segregate it and report.

DEL. McDONALD: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a suggestion—

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, resulting as follows: Total vote, 615; yes, 202; no, 413.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The motion is lost, and the Chair will rule that the secretary will proceed to read and designate the resolutions.

DEL. MOORE: A point of information. Is the Chair going to allow during the reading of these resolutions any jumping-jack proceedings? Is the Chair going to allow any bobbing up here while these resolutions are being read? I ask that so as to save time and not have any discussion.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: How is that?

DEL. MOORE: The point is, is the Chair going to allow bobbing up here between these resolutions and discussing some things?

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: No, if they don't stop I am going to appoint you as sergeant-at-arms to make them quit.

DEL. CRONIN: Mr. Chairman—

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: What is your point of order?

DEL. CRONIN: I haven't any point of order, but a question to ask. I understand now there will be the reading of the resolutions and they will be referred without debate.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: That is it. I take it that with this mode of procedure now we will save time; that by the resolutions being read, numbered and referred, every delegate on this floor who wishes to take part in the deliberations or has any suggestions to

offer to any committee will know where the resolution is and will have an opportunity of doing so and be in a position to make his defense on his contention when it comes back into the convention with the report.

#### NEW COMMITTEES.

DEL. RYAN: Mr. Chairman, we have only three standing committees at the present time, as I understand it—the Committee on Credentials, the Committee on Resolutions, and the Committee on Constitution. Now, as I have stated on the floor before, all the resolutions which are now on the Secretary's desk were at one time in the possession of the Committee on Resolutions. Now, we had an opportunity to become familiar with their contents, and we feel that there are really only two committees in this convention at the present time regularly organized, among which all those resolutions can be divided; and we feel further that we have not got a sufficiency of committees. Regardless of what the subject matter of the various resolutions which now lie on the Secretary's desk may be, they would have to be divided between either the Committee on Constitution or the Committee on Resolutions, and very many of them are not properly the property of either one or the other of those committees. Now, if you would entertain a motion at this time before you proceed to the reading of those resolutions, I would like to offer a motion that we appoint several other committees so that the resolutions can be properly referred. Will you entertain a motion?

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Will you designate in your motion what committees you want appointed?

DEL. RYAN: Yes. I would move that you appoint a committee of five each on Education and Literature; Strikes, Lockouts and Grievances; Ways and Means; Ritual; Auditing Committee; Committee on Officers' Reports; Committee on Organization; and a Committee on Good and Welfare.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: It has been regularly moved and supported that the following committees be appointed: on Education and Literature; Strikes, Lockouts and Grievances; Ways and Means; Ritual; Auditing; Officers' Reports, Organization and Good and Welfare. You have heard the motion; are you ready for the question?

DEL. McDONALD: The Committee on Standing Rules has provided for all these committees, and they have got their report in there. Now, if we are going to take the business from that committee we might as well fire them out altogether. There is no need of it. Now, you are going ahead without any rules whatever after appointing the committee. I suggest that you take the report of the Committee on Standing Rules of Order, and then you have the committees and you have everything to refer to.

A DELEGATE: Second the motion.

DEL. MARKLEY: I want to call your attention to the fact that this forenoon I offered that very motion and it was rejected.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: I did not understand the delegate to make that as a motion.

DEL. McDONALD: I don't want to make the motion and have the Chairman overrule me.

DEL. RYAN: I would like to state in behalf of myself and the seconder of my motion, that with the consent of the convention we will gladly waive action upon our motion until the Committee on

Rules and Order of the convention can report, if they are prepared to do so now.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The Chair is of the opinion that that would be a very wise mode of procedure.

DEL. HOLMES: Is it necessary to make a motion?

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: If there is no objection on the part of any delegate to hearing the report of that committee at this time, being appointed for the purpose of reporting to this convention on rules of order, we will have the report of the committee. Are there any objections? Hearing none, the committee will proceed to make their report.

#### COMMITTEE ON RULES.

Delegate Kleese then read the report of the Committee on Rules and Order of Business.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: You have heard the report of the Committee on Rules and Order.

It was moved and seconded that the report be accepted and adopted.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: It has been regularly moved and supported that the report of the committee be adopted. You have heard the motion; are you ready for the question?

DEL. McMULLEN: I would like to offer an amendment to that report, and it would expedite matters to adopt it at once, if you will. It is simply this, that those committees named by Brother Ryan there in his motion before, which he withdrew, in addition to the ones that are named here, be appointed; mind you, I don't mean a replication, but that they be added to that report. (Seconded.)

DEL. SHENKAN: There is no amendment necessary. I include that in my motion.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: It is moved and seconded that we include in addition to the committees mentioned in the report those committees mentioned by Brother Ryan. Are you ready for the question?

DEL. KEOGH: I would like to add on to it also that instead of the President's report it be the Officers' reports—all the officers' reports.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: There is no second to it, but it is all right. The Chair is of the opinion that it would not be an amendment to the amendment.

DEL. KEOGH: No.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Consequently I do not believe it is in order.

DEL. DUNCAN: As a point of information, I would like to ask if it would be in order, with the common consent of the house, to include, in the motion to accept the committee's report, those committees that were named by Comrade Ryan, in order to save a ruling.

DEL. AUGUSTINE: That is understood.

DEL. McMULLEN: He accepts that.

DEL. AUGUSTINE: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: This amendment will do away with a roll call, if there is no objection, to facilitate time.

DEL. DE LEON: I desire to know whether I understood correctly one portion of that report. Has the secretary got a copy of it? There is a provision there, I understand, that we shall take up a certain day with a discussion of a number of things. Will you read that?

DEL. KLEESE: Thursday morning.

DEL. DE LEON: Will you read those things that there is to be a discussion of on Thursday morning?

DEL. KLEESE: Tactics and Details, May First as International Labor Day, Agreements and Contracts, and International Relations.

DEL. DE LEON: Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer an amendment in some way so as to make that clause read, "Provided the Committee on Constitution has no report to present." In other words, to give the Committee on Constitution the right of way over this proposed topics debate. My reason is that those topics are highly interesting and serious topics, but they will take up surely the whole day. Now, if the Committee on Constitution is ready to report, surely the matter that has been presented to the Committee on Constitution is of more immediate and practical importance than these abstract questions, and if we give those abstract questions the right of way, why, then we are compelled to sit here just that much longer. The report of the Committee on Constitution will have to be heard. This thing may be dispensed with. If we have the time for it, all right, so much the better. If we have no time for it, why, so much the worse, and we cannot help it and it can be done otherwise. My motion implies to give the right of way to the Committee on Constitution, and if the Committee on Rules will accept that suggestion it will simplify it, otherwise I will feel constrained to offer it as an amendment.

DEL. KLEESE: I will accept it, for one.

DEL. DE LEON: There are two others.

DEL. KLEESE: Bro. McDonald. I think Bro. Abbott is not here.

DEL. DE LEON: Well, it has been accepted.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The motion before the house at this time is to concur in the report of your committee, which will also embody now the additional committees mentioned by Del. Ryan, and the understanding that Del De Leon has embodied with the consent of the committee that the Constitution Committee will have the right of way on general discussion.

DEL. FOX: Mr. Chairman, I would like to propose another amendment to one of those rules. The committee, I believe, has adopted Robert's Rules of Order, and the question arose the other day that that bound us in certain cases to a two-thirds majority, and it might arise again. Therefore I propose this amendment to that clause: "Providing, that no rule shall bind us to a two-thirds majority." (Amendment seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The Chair would rule the amendment out of order. If you have Robert's Rules of Order apply at all, then I am going to have Robert's Rules of Order all apply. If we ain't, we ain't. Let me explain, delegates. The Chair is of the opinion that you adopted these tactics: that it does not make any difference which side to a motion refers to Robert's Rules of Order in any way whatsoever, the other side will contend that it has been done for the purpose of taking advantage. Now, then, if you are going to say that you are going to have Robert's Rules we will have Robert's Rules of Order. If you are not going to have it, then you better not have it, because that is all you are going to do, brother delegates, to provide

ways and means here to throw yourselves in a tangle on a point that will drag out for hours and hours on any question. I would sooner not have it at all than do that. I would sooner the convention would say, if we want a thing of that kind, that a majority vote shall rule on any question, and then you don't need it.

DEL. FOX: The fact that this is so strongly objected to shows how necessary it is. You must put this control in there if you want to carry anything here. We can do that; we can adopt Robert's Rules of Order and exclude any rule we like to, and so let us accept this proposition that we are not bound to a two-third's majority.

DEL. KLEESE: I would like as a member of that committee to state to Bro. Fox that that part reads—I think I worded that myself—"So far as they do not retard the progress of this convention, Robert's Rules of Order shall be accepted."

DEL. PARKS: To make that definite and certain, I move an amendment to the report of the Committee on Rules of Order, that a majority vote shall decide all questions coming before this convention. (Seconded.)

DEL. FOX: I will accept that.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The motion has now been amended to amend that portion of the report pertaining to Robert's Rules of Order to the extent that a majority vote will decide all questions in this body. (Question called for.) You are now voting on the amendment.

DEL. KLEESE: Let us have a unanimous vote.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Is there any objection on the part of any delegate on the floor to being recorded as voting in favor of this motion?

DEL. McMULLEN: There is.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The Secretary will call the roll.

DEL. McMULLEN: I have reasons to give for my position. My reason is this, that a majority vote under this proposed rule would cut off debate, or in other words, would carry the previous question. Robert's Rules of Order distinctly and plainly say that you cannot carry the previous question or cut off debate without a two-third's majority. There are a number of propositions of that kind relating to the right of an individual member on this floor which a majority could deprive him of at any time. Robert's Rules of Order provide that when you take from a man his personal rights you must do so overwhelmingly by a two-thirds majority; and it is for those reasons, to protect the individuality of each of these that may wish to exercise it, either in speech or by vote, that I am opposed to this amendment. I should prefer that you simply do not refer to any manual of parliamentary law, and simply say that a majority vote controls on any question, no matter what it may be, but I do not wish to work with reference to some parliamentary mode of procedure and then make an absurd amendment to it. That is the view I take of this, and that is why I shall oppose it.

DEL. FOX: Roll call.

DEL. PARKS: As the mover of the motion I want to state why I stand for the majority rule under these circumstances. Two men over here hold almost one-third of the votes of this convention, and that would put us at the mercy of these two men and one or two of the other obstructionists who have been operating to delay business on the floor, to keep us from closing debate if they stood together. Now, this is our opportunity to provide that no two men and one or two supporters will be able to prolong the debate here

when the majority of us have made up our minds long ago that we are going to vote on this question. And I think that is nothing more than just and fair, and will expedite business and the time of this convention, so that we will be sure about majority rule.

DEL. KINNEALLY: I move the previous question. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: I believe you can have a roll call on this amendment that is offered, without moving the previous question.

A DELEGATE: Go ahead; no objection.

THE CHAIRMAN: I do not see anybody wanting to discuss it further. I think you all know how you want to vote.

A DELEGATE: Yes.

DEL. MOSKOVITZ: Mr. Chairman—

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: If you vote, then you will know where you are at. The Secretary will call the roll.

DEL. ST. JOHN: I would like to ask whether, if this amendment is voted on, it will shut off any further debate on this report. If it is I am going to call attention to one matter that the report has overlooked entirely, and that is the fact that it does not remedy the condition we are in, that you cannot get a vote without a roll call, and I think that is the most important duty that that committee ought to perform, so as to let us take a vote without a roll call here.

DEL. MOSKOVITZ: That is just what I have been asking the floor for.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: What is that?

DEL. MOSKOVITZ: For the reason that Bro. St. John just mentions.

DEL. PARKS: Let us vote on this amendment, and then take up another amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The Chair will rule at this time that a motion of that kind is out of order unless you suspend another section of the constitution. I am not going to take or try to take, through a ruling, the individual right of any delegate away from him. Unless this convention does that by a vote, the Chair would rule that a motion of that kind is out of order.

DEL. PARKS: Which? My motion?

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Not your motion; no, your motion is in order.

DEL. McMULLEN: I rise to a point of order. Haven't we got the previous question?

DEL. PARKS: Yes.

DEL. McMULLEN: Then put it; that means to shut off debate.

THE CHAIRMAN: The previous question was withdrawn.

DEL. McMULLEN: No, I do not understand that it was withdrawn.

A DELEGATE: It was by unanimous consent.

DEL. McMULLEN: If it is by unanimous consent, that means silence.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The Chair understood it was withdrawn, and that the Secretary would call the roll if there was no further discussion. The vote occurs on the motion to provide that a majority vote will decide all questions in this convention—whether to reconsider, whether to move the previous question under Robert's Rules of Order or otherwise. The Secretary will call the roll. Those voting in favor of the amendment to that motion will vote yes. Those in favor of the tactics of parliamentary law will vote no.

DEL. RYAN: A point of information, if you please. I would like to ask when you say a majority vote, whether you mean a majority



of all the votes represented in the convention or a majority of those voting.

THE CHAIRMAN: A majority of the votes represented in this convention.

DEL. RYAN: All right.

The roll was then called and resulted as follows: Total vote, 629; Yes, 407; No, 222.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The amendment is carried. The vote now occurs on the motion to amend in adopting the report of the committee by the appointment of the following committees: Committee on Education and Literature; Strikes, Lockouts and Grievances; Ritual; Officers' Reports; Organization; Ways and Means; Good and Welfare; and the rest of the general report of your committee as amended. You have heard the motion.

DEL. McMULLEN: Do we understand from Bro. De Leon that the Constitution Committee should have the right of way?

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Yes, that is the understanding.

DEL. McMULLEN: That is a part of the report?

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: You have heard the motion; are you ready for the question now?

A DELEGATE: No objection.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: If there is no objection on the part of any delegate to being recorded as voting in the affirmative on this motion? Hearing none, the motion—

DEL. SIMS: I want to be recorded as voting yes.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: You need not worry getting up that way; you only delay. You are all recorded as voting yes.

#### RESOLUTIONS.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Now the Chair will rule that the Secretary will proceed to read the resolutions; the Chair will rule in accordance with the rules you have established, and that the delegates will keep order.

#### APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEES.

DEL. AUGUSTINE: Mr. Chairman—

DEL. FOX: Mr. Chairman, you want to appoint those committees that Bro. Ryan referred to.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is right. The committees are not appointed as yet.

DEL. AUGUSTINE: That is what I wanted to call your attention to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is it the consensus of the opinion of the delegates present that they wish the Chair to proceed to appoint these committees, with their approval?

DELEGATES: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: It is pretty hard to proceed, you know, without any preparations at all.

DEL. HANNEMANN: I think the best way to proceed is to read the resolutions and let them be referred to the different committees. By that time you may have been able to make up a list of those names. I don't think he could possibly know the names now. The Chairman ought to have a little time to prepare his list.

DEL. FOX: That is acceptable to me.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: If there is no objection on the part of any delegate, you already having designated your committees, if the delegates wish to have the resolutions read and laid out for the proper committees and allow the committees to be appointed later,

that will possibly be the proper procedure, so that every delegate and every section of the country will be represented on every committee as far as possible. The Chair would be in favor of having you proceed in that way.

A DELEGATE: No objection; proceed.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The Secretary will proceed to read the resolutions. Del. Smith, will you take the chair?

(Del. Smith took the chair.)

The following resolutions and amendments were then read by the Secretary and referred to the respective committees as noted:

#### No. 1.

Union No. 86, I. W. W.,  
Omaha, Sept. 16, 1906.

Officers and Delegates of National Convention I. W. W.

We, the committee of Local No. 86, I. W. W., elected with full power to act, in meeting assembled, decided not to send a delegate to this our second annual convention for the reasons, we regret to say, of time, distance and want of funds.

By motion duly made and seconded we endorse the following:

1. UNION LABEL. We are in favor of the abolition of the union label for the reasons apparent to any class conscious wage-worker.

2. RITUAL. We are in favor of the abolition of the ritual, as it savors of star-chamber methods.

3. PROFESSIONAL CLASS. We are of the opinion that the doors of the I. W. W. should be closed to the professional class and open only to the bonafide wage-workers.

4. DEPARTMENTAL OFFICERS: We endorse the position of Local Cincinnati as published in the Weekly People of Aug. 25, 1906.

5. SALARIES OF OFFICERS. We endorse the position of Local Cincinnati on the same.

6. OFFICIAL ORGAN. We stand in favor of the official organ of the Industrial Workers being placed upon a weekly and daily basis as soon as our finances will permit the same.

7. ORGANIZATION. We stand for a thoroughly democratic organization, in which all of its officers are elected by the votes of the membership and all laws and actions of the General Executive Board upon matters of general and national importance be referred to the membership at large for consideration and vote.

8. IN CONCLUSION. Allow us to express our appreciation of the uniform kindness of the general officers of the I. W. W. and also our appreciation of their management of the affairs of the I. W. W.

We believe that the I. W. W. have every reason to feel proud of and satisfied with the growth and development of the I. W. W.

We also beg our brother delegates to view our reasons for not being with you at this our second annual convention, in a spirit of kindness, and we assure you that we are with you in the great task of emancipation of the working class of America and of the whole world.

Fraternally yours,

F. H. ALEXANDER.

B. H. VAIL.

FRED KISSEL.

JOS. PARISEAU.

Committee.

(Constitution Committee.)

## No. 2.

Whereas wage-workers following certain lines in industry will and do find it impossible to send the percapita of twenty-five cents to headquarters and still have enough left from the monthly dues to carry on the work of the local union,

Therefore be it resolved that the Executive of the I. W. W. provide for a sliding scale of dues per capita which will be consistent with the average wages paid in any particular calling in any particular district or country.

Submitted by Local No. 198, Toronto, Canada.

James Reid, Delegate.

(Constitution Committee.)

## No. 3.

Tobacco Workers' Union, No. 89,

Cleveland, O., Sept. 17, 1906.

Delegates to Convention of I. W. W.,  
Chicago, Ill.

Comrades and Fellow Workers:

About a year ago we had some grievances with our employers. We were working under such circumstances and conditions that if we tolerated them we would eventually be wiped out.

So we sent an authorized delegate to general headquarters at Chicago, Ill., to explain our situation. After going over the facts and grievances with the General Executive Board a strike was ordered and endorsed by them.

Now, about a week later our General President C. O. Sherman arrived, and our condition at that time was explained to him, and in his address to the strikers and others who had assembled at the hall to hear him, he explained that we would be given support financially, even if the strike lasted four months instead of one week.

Well, our strike lasted about two weeks longer and we were gaining our demands and all strikers were firm; after having been threatened, offered bribes, and employers getting their work made in other towns and even starting factories in other towns, our ranks were not depleted by a single man, but we ran short on money, as no more was being sent in through contributions, so our Secretary informed the general headquarters, and General Secretary W. E. Trautmann arrived next day and immediately went into conference with our local officers.

The situation at the time was gone through, and he could not resist the earnest appeal for assistance that was made to him, so he went into council with Local Executive Board to devise ways and means to get money. They finally agreed upon raising money on a note issued and endorsed by General Secretary W. E. Trautmann, to be paid in six months.

Now, some of our brother strikers, upon being apprized of the way they took of raising money, agreed to loan their whole savings on above conditions, and being only poor working people, had not much to offer, but what little they had they loaned on the above note.

The strike lasted only about two weeks longer, and we won out every point and grievance. After the strike having been duly declared off, we immediately went back to work and everything went on nicely till New Year's; then the trade became dull and slow and employers started to take advantage of dullness and started giving us trouble first by laying us off for a period of three weeks; then

we came back to work and worked half days but five days of the week, for a period of about six months, working all that time at the rate of about \$7 or \$8 per week on the average. But we fought them gamely. When first one shop and then another would try to introduce a cut in wages, we still kept on paying dues and assessments from the meager wage allotted to us, till some were disheartened by long battle and constant agitation by employers' agents, cowardly, unthinking scapegoats, who for money sold their good fellowship, honor and principle and went back to work at a reduced rate.

Well, not taking them for an example, we are still in the ring and fighting, and we have today a lockout in one of the shops employing eight men, that we are keeping up with their benefit weekly. So you can readily see the reason why we did not pay off more of the debt contracted for by note issued, which we now ask the brother delegates to the convention to take into consideration and order the note paid, so that the money can be paid back to them as soon as possible, as they have been borrowing money from other sources on the strength of loan on note, to live on, as I explained, their meager wage earnings, and they are in need of that money now, as we were in need of it then.

For further information we refer you to our delegate Bro. Sol. Rotkovitz, who will explain gladly any question asked him. Hoping this statement will meet with favor and approval, we remain

Faternally yours,

I. R. KAPPERMAN, Sec'y.

(Seal of Union.)

Local 89, I. W. W.

(Referred to Grievance Committee.)

#### No. 4.

Mixed Industries Local No. 365,  
Jamestown, N. Y.

Fellow Workers and Comrades:

I am instructed by Local No. 365 to ask you to assign an organizer to this city for some time. The reasons for this request that Jamestown is one of the biggest centers of the furniture industry in the United States, and there is not a single organization among the several thousands of furniture workers. There are also several thousands of textile workers, also without a single organization, and over a thousand metal workers with no organization, besides several other smaller industries in an unorganized state.

The A. F. of L. is on the wane here; its only hold is on the "Label" unions. On the other hand, we find the manufacturers are thoroughly organized. It is the belief of our local that much could be accomplished on the line of organization, if an organizer would be sent here.

You are also requested by the local to empower the incoming administration to print the constitution in the Swedish language.

Faternally,

O. BELDNER,

Secretary Mixed Industries, No. 365.

(Committee on Organization.)

#### No. 5.

Chicago, Sept. 20, 1906.

We recommend as a way of getting a defense fund, that the general organization should levy an assessment on all members in said organization every three months to be used for strikes and lockouts only.

We also recommend that no militia man be taken in as a member in said organization.

We also recommend that if Organizer Shurtleff continue as organizer he be instructed to use different methods than he has done in the past.

FRED W. HAVER,

Local No. 190, Silk Workers' Industrial Union,  
Brooklyn, N. Y.

(Organization Committee; see below.)

A DELEGATE: Grievance Committee.

ANOTHER DELEGATE: Organization.

DEL. ROTKOVITZ: A point of order. I would request the Chair to decide as to where those should go, and not have every one of the delegates tell the Chairman what to do with it.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: I will let you brothers decide that. Which committee shall this communication be referred to?

DEL. MARKLEY: There are two recommendations in there.

DEL. PARKS: It looks as though it ought to go to three different committees. There are three different subjects in it.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: I will refer those to the Organization Committee. Is there any objection? So ordered.

#### No. 6.

Chicago, Sept. 24, 1906.

Whereas, the financial report of the General Secretary-Treasurer of the I. W. W. shows that the Department of Metal and Machinery did not pay per capita tax for the required 3,000 members up to May, 1906; and

Whereas, the nomination and election of officers held in 1905 for the term of Jan. 1, 1906, to Jan. 1, 1907, was only held from a few old locals of the United Metal Workers, and locals organized since August, 1905, have had no chance to make such nominations and vote upon them; therefore, be it

Resolved; that this second annual convention declares hereby that such a Department as a Metal and Machinery Department is now in existence, and further orders that all offices except the office of Secretary-Treasurer be declared vacant, and said Secretary-Treasurer be ordered to send out at once a call for nominations of an Executive Board and Secretary-Treasurer.

Respectfully submitted,

PAUL SCHWEINBURG, Delegate,

Local 2, M. & M. Dept.

(Committee on Constitution.)

#### No. 7.

Whereas, the wage-working class of Canada being ripe for the acceptance of the principles of revolutionary economic organization, be it

Resolved, that steps be taken at once by the Industrial Workers of the World to place an organizer in the above mentioned field and that we suggest that Robert Roadhouse be appointed to that position.

JAMES M. REID,

Delegate, Local No. 195, Toronto, Can.

W. I. LEACH,

Delegate, Local No. 229, Montreal, Can.

E. U. LUNDY,

Delegate, Local No. 297, Newcastle, Pa.

(Committee on Organization.)

## No. 8.

ASST. SEC. EDWARDS: Will the delegates agree that the delegate submitting No. 8 may put in another copy? It was one submitted by the same delegate from Montreal, Toronto and Newcastle, as I remember, but it seems to be missing. Maybe we will find it later.

(No objection heard.)

## No. 9.

Whereas, the military organizations of the United States have been and are constantly being used to intimidate the working class, to break strikes, and to assist the capitalist class, always, therefore, be it

Resolved, that this convention insist that its respective members belonging to such military organizations withdraw therefrom at the expiration of their respective terms.

Submitted by Local No. 193.

ULRICH FRUEH.

(Committee on Constitution.)

## No. 10.

Individual resolution submitted by Del. Cox of St. Louis.

(Committee on Constitution.)

## No. 11.

Whereas, the word Brother or Brothers is extensively used in all organizations; and

Whereas, this term having been so abused in the past that as a greeting term it has lost its significance (if it every had any); and

Whereas, the revolutionary economic organization being distinctly different from all other forms of organization, ought to establish the use of a distinctly different term of greeting;

Therefore, Local 84 of St. Louis, Mo., Resolves that the use of the term Brother be discontinued, and recommends that the terms Comrade and Comrades, which are appropriate, be unanimously used instead.

W. W. COX, Secretary.

(Seal of Union.)

(Committee on Resolutions.)

## No. 11½.

Whereas, the office connected with the Pure and Simple Union known as Business Agent, is used, being established for that purpose, to browbeat the workers, whipping them into submission with the so-called closed shop proposition connected with the so-called agreements, which is the important feature of the agreement with the union (the officers) and through this they are able to rake in the dues, fines, and assessments, by threats of loss of job, by expulsion from the union, physical force often being used; thus these Business Agents but fill the place of a local labor lieutenant always working in the interests of the employer;

Resolved, therefore, that there is no room in the I. W. W. for any such office, and local No. 84 of St. Louis, Mo., demands that the use of the term Business Agent as applied to our local organizers be discontinued, for it is a stench in our nostrils.

W. W. COX, Secretary.

(Committee on Constitution.)

## No. 13.

Resolution adopted unanimously at regular meeting of South Chicago Local Lodge, No. 5, of the Transportation Department of the I. W. W., held Monday, Sept. 10, 1906.

Whereas, it is common knowledge that a few self-seeking individuals who have failed in their efforts to rule the Transportation Department of the Industrial Workers of the World, will, at the approaching national convention of the Industrial Workers of the World, use every dishonorable means known in the art of corrupt manipulation to bring about the abolition of the Transportation Department; and

Whereas, South Chicago Local Lodge No. 5, firmly believing that such an unwarranted procedure would certainly interrupt the peaceful relations now existing between the Transportation Department and the parent body and likely to result in the disruption of the department, exercises its constitutional prerogative to declare its unalterable opposition to this contemplated plan of destructive legislation in the following resolution:

Be it resolved, that the delegate, Brother L. M. Kohl, representing the Transportation Department of the I. W. W. at the national convention of the I. W. W., be and he is hereby instructed to oppose in every legal and just way and all efforts to deprive this constituency of its departmental identity. Be it further

Resolved, that a copy of this resolution be spread upon the minutes of this meeting, and that a copy be delivered to Delegate L. M. Kohl, and also a copy be mailed to Board of Directors of the Transportation Department.

GEO. THORN, Fin. Sec.,  
P. BERNER, Pres't,  
Local No. 5.

(Seal of Local Union.)

(Grievance Committee.)

## No. 14.

New York District Council investigation. Submitted by Iazarus Goldberg.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Is there any objection to handing that to the Grievance Committee and having the delegate make his statement on the floor?

DELEGATES: No.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Hearing none, it will be so ordered.

On motion, the convention then adjourned until 9 A. M. Wednesday, Sept. 26.

## TENTH DAY.

WEDNESDAY, SEPT. 26, 1906.

President Sherman called the convention to order at 9 A. M.

The Secretary called the roll.

THE CHAIRMAN: I believe that at the adjournment last night we were on the resolutions. If there is no objection we will proceed with the reading of the resolutions. I desire to say that the Chair's attention is called to the fact that the committees were ordered to be appointed, and if it is the desire or wish of the convention before proceeding to these resolutions the committees will be announced, if there is no objection. There seems to be none, and you may announce your committees.

Delegate Mahoney, Chairman pro tem at the last session, then announced the appointment of the following committees:

## COMMITTEES.

Education and Literature—M. Dumas, D. McKnight, Saml. J. French, J. W. Johnson, Wm. Ahern,  
 Strikes and Grievances—J. M. Brown, W. J. Rogers, Henry V. Jackson, Phillip Veal, Lillian Forberg.

Ritual—Eugene Fischer, Paul Schweinburg, Herman Richter, Albert Schulz, J. E. Fitzgerald.

Auditing—J. McMullen, W. R. Fox, Emanuel Hauck, E. R. Markley, B. Stone.

Organization—Wade Parkes, Jas. M. Reid, Sig. Moskowitz, T. Petriella, E. R. McDonald.

Ways and Means—C. H. Duncan, L. M. Kohl, W. J. Hannemann, W. L. Hall, Jos. Mullady.

Good and Welfare—A. L. Smith, F. W. Heslewood, R. T. Sims, F. G. Moore, Geo. S. Holmes.

Officers' Reports—J. Shenkan, Geo. Abbott, J. Motherwell, W. J. Pinkerton, W. M. McCue.

Various changes were made in the committees as first announced, until the result was as appears above.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any further objections or suggestions by the delegates? If not, if it is the unanimous consent to permit these committees to stand as read, it will be so ordered.

## COMMUNICATIONS.

The Secretary read the following communication:

"Brooklyn, N. Y., Sept. 22, 1906.

"Industrial Workers' Convention:

"Fraternal greetings and best wishes for success.

"(Signed) SILK WORKERS' INDUSTRIAL UNION 190.

"Heuttner, Secretary."

Also the following:

"To the Convention of the

Industrial Workers of the World.

"Comrades:

"It is now about a year and a half ago that a cry of horror and indignation went up from the whole civilized world at the news of Bloody Sunday in St. Petersburg.

"Since then the heroic struggle of the Russian people for political and industrial freedom has been going on incessantly.

"Many thousands of men and women and youth have heroically laid down their lives for the cause, but still more have sprung up ready to take their place, equally brave and energetic.

"Again and again the government has been forced to promise reforms, again and again it has broken its promises, matching its treachery with its cruelty. It is a long struggle. Despotism dies hard. It is the class conscious workingmen who have led in this fight. They have dared and suffered as never did any class before in the world's history. No sufferings can daunt them. From every defeat they rally, prepared to fight yet more vigorously for their political and industrial liberty. They are sure of victory and are ready to pay the price.

"Comrades, you can help your comrades in Russia! You can hasten their victory, you can make it easier. You ought to help them, for they are fighting your battle as well as their own. The cause of liberty and progress is the same the world over.

"They need money to buy arms for the fight with their murderous oppressors; they need money to buy bread for themselves and their



families so their strength shall not fail when the critical moment comes.

"Comrades, your comrades in Russia stretch out their hands to you, and we hope not in vain.

"Fraternally yours,

"D. RUBINOW,  
"Secretary of Executive  
Committee, R. S. D. S."

#### TRANSFER OF VOTES.

DEL. MAHONEY (in the chair): There have been two requests made for an appropriation of votes which delegates believe they are entitled to. Del. Fitzgerald asked me yesterday that he be given a chance to explain a vote that he believes belongs to him, and I think possibly before we get through with what is before the house we might give him a chance to have the vote that he believes belongs to him. I believe he has got a right to cast it when a question comes up. Is there any objection on the part of any delegate to having him make himself clear on that, so that we will understand what it is? If not, you may proceed, Bro. Fitzgerald.

DEL. FITZGERALD: Brother delegates, I came here representing two local unions of San Antonio, Texas, No. 7 of the Transportation Department and No. 185 Mixed Local. The Committee on Credentials assured me that the credentials from 185 were all O. K., and as soon as the Transportation Department were seated I would be allowed that vote, and in justice to the local I would like to represent that local and cast the vote of Local No. 185 of San Antonio.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Has the Credentials Committee anything to offer on this?

DEL. McMULLEN: Speaking from memory—of course I looked at a good many credentials and I want Bro. Fitzgerald to stop me if I am not right—when the matter was before the Credentials Committee wasn't there something about asking whether you were in good standing, Bro. Fitzgerald?

DEL. FITZGERALD: I would like to have you ask that question again, please.

DEL. McMULLEN: I say, it is difficult for anyone to recall any particular credential. I am unable to do so; there is nothing that fixes it in my mind; but I remember something about your standing as a member in the organization. You understand, the point came out here when these brothers were seated, that you were in bad standing. When you were before the committee it was prior to the disposition of this case in here. Now you have been declared in good standing since, and if you are in good standing sufficiently to represent one bunch of mixed locals you are certainly in good standing enough to represent another. But the showing that you made to the committee, as I recall it, was that you were not in good standing. Now, isn't that the showing made to the committee?

DEL. FITZGERALD: The convention since that time has taken action.

DEL. McMULLEN: Yes.

DEL. FITZGERALD: And our local has been in good standing. Therefore, I ask for that vote on that ground.

DEL. McMULLEN: That is what I stated, that at the time the brother was before the Credentials Committee we thought, at the time, that if that brother was in arrears of dues he was not in good standing and could not represent that local. But the convention has

since that declared that he is in sufficiently good standing to represent them. Now, if he is in good standing enough to represent any one local or bunch of locals, he is certainly in good standing enough to represent 185. That is the situation, and that is the reason we passed the judgment that we did.

DEL. MOSKOVITZ: I move that that vote be given to Del. Fitzgerald. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: It is regularly moved and supported that Bro. Fitzgerald be allowed this vote from 185.

A DELEGATE: No objection.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: You have heard the motion as stated. Is there any objection on the part of any delegate to giving this vote to Del. Fitzgerald?

DEL. McMULLEN: I have no desire to force a roll call, but I simply desire that the minutes shall show that I voted no on the seating of this brother.

DEL. CRONIN: I don't want to take up the time, but there is a statement that I feel I have a right to make. I wish to be recorded as voting against the granting of this vote at this time. My contention is that the brother is not a member of the Industrial Workers of the World.

DEL. KIRKPATRICK: A point of information. As I understand, the contention is that these locals should be represented. The Credentials Committee, as I understand, made a report that Fitzgerald was not a member of the Industrial Workers of the World, or not in good standing. I want to know if a point was brought out to this convention. Did the delegates understand, or have the delegates decided that he is a member of the Industrial Workers of the World? I would like to know if the Chair understands it that way.

DEL. PARKS: I think I can throw some light on this subject. I was one of the three on the status of the Transportation Department. We covered all this ground in pursuance of the motion that was duly made and adopted, taking the matter of the credentials of these contesting delegates of the Transportation Department out of the hands of the Committee on Credentials, and we reported here the other morning. Our report has been adopted and it is the property of this convention, and Bro. Fitzgerald was duly seated according to our report. We found that he was in good standing according to the agreements and rules that we read in the Committee of the Whole, which was concurred in after we came into the convention from committee work. Therefore I think there ought to be no more squabbles or no more parliamentary points raised regarding these names. If they want a roll call, let them have it.

DEL. MOTHERWELL: I won't take but a minute's time. As I understand this matter, and as all the delegates, I think, understand, Bro. Fitzgerald came here to this convention and the Credentials Committee took the stand that he was not in good standing in No. 7, which local he belongs to. The delegates or a majority of them said he is in good standing. Now, 185 voted to ask him to represent them in this convention, which is in good standing. Are we going to be unfair and say that Union 185 shall have no representative, on a technicality? I cannot understand the position of these two brothers over here, that they should take such a stand when their obligation to the Industrial Workers of the World is that they will acquiesce in the will of the majority at all times, and the majority has said that No. 7 and its delegate here are in standing, and still these men will get up here on technicalities and contend that he is

not in standing. They are trying to override the will of the majority, and they ought to be ashamed of themselves.

DEL. FOX: Mr. Chairman—

DEL. CRONIN: Mr. Chairman, I am not here to listen to any man—

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Bro. Fox has the floor.

DEL. CRONIN: All right.

DEL. FOX: There is no technicality whatever involved in this. This convention is the highest law of the Industrial Workers of the World and has declared Comrade Fitzgerald in good standing, and he is in good standing. He was in good standing, according to our recognition given him at the time of the Hall-Kohl controversy; and the convention by their formal motion declared him so, and the committee in its report declared him so, and that committee was sustained by this convention, so that there is no technicality involved. He is in good standing and entitled to represent 185 as well as No. 7.

DEL. HAVER: A point of order. It is that we cut out all this wrangling and have a roll call and let these people that are objecting be recorded. We have wasted more time in discussion on this matter than we would have in having a roll call.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: A roll call has been called for. Proceed to call the roll on the question of giving Bro. Fitzgerald the right to cast a vote for Local Union 185.

The roll was then called, and before the vote was announced—

DEL. HESLEWOOD: In view of the fact that Bro. St. John and Bro. Ryan have just come in now, and the whole vote depends on the vote of these two men, I think it is no more than fair that the announcement of the vote wait till they have an opportunity to cast their vote. It depends on their vote, and they have 109 votes apiece. I think that would be nothing but fair.

DEL. McINTOSH: Make that as a motion.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The Chair would rule that that would be, in the mind of the Chair, not a point of order well taken unless you have a written request from the others, because they know the time our convention convenes, and I believe they should be here the same as all the other delegates.

DEL. McMULLEN: I want to say that Cronin and I ask simply to be recorded as voting in the negative. We didn't force this roll call, and we have nothing to say but just to ask to be recorded in the negative. Now, I have not the least objection to your ruling that all these brothers can vote, notwithstanding the Chair can certainly rule that there being a quorum present, any vote taken is legal. I haven't any practical objection, and I don't believe McDonald has, and I don't believe Cronin has. I don't care if they keep this vote open forty years. All we want is to be recorded in the negative, voting for what we feel is just here. You can keep the vote open as long as you wish, you will get no protest from us.

DEL. McDONALD: I am quite willing that any absentees' vote that Bro. Heslewood wishes recorded be recorded. I don't want to take any snap judgment at all in this convention. If you want to delay it I am perfectly satisfied to delay it, and I believe at the same time you might as well defer to the wishes of Ryan and St. John and they might as well be recorded.

DEL. FITZGERALD: I would like to have that report laid over until such time as St. John and Ryan may be made acquainted with those facts.

DEL. HESLEWOOD: St. John and Ryan are both here now, and

they have a right to be informed so as to vote intelligently, and it will not delay the convention.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: A roll call has been called for and the roll has been closed, but the Chair does not want to act unfairly, and I will say this, that if there is no objection on the part of the men who made the motion and seconded it for the roll call, seeing that the two brothers who hold the two largest votes have voted against this—if you have no objection the Chair has no objection; and as they have said they have no objection to their voting, I will rule that they can cast their vote on this question if they want to. Now I will say to Delegate St. John and Delegate Ryan—I think they are both here—that there has a question arisen. Bro. Fitzgerald has asked to cast the vote for 185 in Texas. I believe they have only one vote, have they not?

DEL. FITZGERALD: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: A roll call was called for, and you brothers were absent. The roll call was completed before you came in the room, but the two brothers who carry the largest vote on the other side said they had no objection to your casting a vote here on his being given the votes, and I will rule that you can cast your vote yes or no whether he shall have that vote. There will be no argument on this at all. They will cast their vote and close this up.

DEL. KIRKPATRICK: I desire to make myself clear on this proposition—

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The delegate will be seated and we will have the vote.

DEL. KIRKPATRICK: I think I have a right to do it.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The delegate will be seated. You are out of order at this time.

DEL. RYAN: I vote Yes.

DEL. ST. JOHN: I vote Yes.

The vote was then announced, as follows: Total vote, 623; Yes, 377; No, 246.

President Sherman resumed the chair.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is carried, and Bro. Fitzgerald will cast the vote for Local Union 185. There was another delegate, I believe, that wanted to vote here. Who was that?

DEL. HANNEMANN: I believe the Musical Union has a right to ten votes. There were two representatives of this union present, one W. Shurtleff, and the other J. Schomberg. At the first roll call we heard their two names read, the understanding being that they would each have five votes. Since then, somehow, the vote has stood ten on Bro. Schomberg. I believe these brothers desire each to be represented here with five votes, therefore I would move you that it so stand.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection on the part of any delegate here to the vote of the Musical Union representatives being divided equally between the two delegates, giving five to each of them?

A DELEGATE: No objection.

DEL. McMULLEN: There is just this explanation. I don't recall that the last name that the brother mentions is on the roll—Shurtleff. My memory is that those brothers' credentials were presented here after this Musical matter was settled by the convention so that he would be seated as a delegate representing a sub-division of the Public Service Department. I don't want to misquote. That is it, isn't it?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

DEL. McMULLEN: And this delegate did not exactly represent that subdivision. The whole point rests on this, that their claim for representation is on a point of number. That is the unfortunate part of this. If a brother who has 10 votes has the right to split his 10 votes into 5, then someone else, this or another brother, has got the right, as I understand, to do the same thing, even if it is only two votes. That is the only point.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair would like to ask, is the Musical Union represented here by any delegate at this time? Is either one of the delegates here?

A DELEGATE: Schomberg is.

THE CHAIRMAN: Where is he?

The delegate was pointed out.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is it satisfactory to you to have the 10 votes divided between yourself and Shurtleff?

DEL. SCHOMBERG: It was suggested to be done that way, and the argument was raised.

THE CHAIRMAN: I ask the question, are you willing to have this vote split?

DEL. SCHOMBERG: We agreed that I should represent 10 votes.

THE CHAIRMAN: It was agreed that you should?

DEL. SCHOMBERG: Yes.

DEL. FITZGERALD: I object. This convention gave these two men five votes each, and they cannot split this if they want to. It is for this convention to say whether they may do it or not.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, it is certainly for the convention. I was trying to get unanimous consent to go ahead with the business. I first wanted to get the consent of those that I believe are most interested, because this is not a question of splitting votes outside of the department or union. It is within their own home. I don't see any objection, and I guess there is perfect harmony.

The following credential was read by the Secretary:

This is to certify that I, W. Shurtleff, representing the Musical and Theatrical Division of the Public Service Department, delegate J. Schomberg to cast my vote in the convention of the Industrial Workers of the World during my absence.

W. SHURTLEFF.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you satisfied? If there is no objection the request will be complied with and Bro. Schomberg will cast ten votes for the Musical Union. That settles that.

The following credential was next read by the Secretary:

"Chicago, Sept. 23, 1906.

"Wm. E. Trautmann,

"Secretary I. W. W. Convention.

"Comrade: This is to certify that Brother E. R. Markley has been appointed by Local No. 167 as proxy for Brother Albert Simpson, who is unable to further attend.

"PAUL DE COLIGNY, President.

"CHAS. DOWNING, Rec. and Cor. Sec'y."

(Seal.)

DEL. McMULLEN: I move that the vote be granted by unanimous consent. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: If there is no objection the request will be granted and Del. Markley will cast the vote.

DEL. HANNEMANN: In this communication a proxy is named. I would like to have it understood that this is intended to mean

alternate and not proxy. What I mean is that it be the consensus of opinion of all those present that it is understood by us that that is intended to mean alternate and not proxy. That of course was a vote no doubt taken by their local, that they desire this man should be considered an alternate and not a proxy. Otherwise I will object and I will vote against it. I would like to ask you to put that question before the house.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any one here representing 167, Chicago?

DEL. TULLAR: There was someone here.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is pretty hard to get from this audience what they meant, whether they meant proxy or alternate. They say proxy here.

DEL. FOX: They really meant delegate.

THE CHAIRMAN: I expect they meant alternate, but they simply used the other word.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: There is no difference.

THE CHAIRMAN: The meaning is there. In my estimation it is in good faith. It has the seal, and I believe it was in good faith. I have every reason to believe it was in good faith.

DEL. HANNEMANN: While I have no doubt it is in good faith, and I understand them so, and they mean alternate, at the same time if we leave it stand as proxy it will simply mean this: that the original delegate can come here at any time and take his place, and if he desires to leave the hall he will have his proxy present to vote for him. That would be unfair to all the other delegates here. In the second place, I do not believe in proxies. It is a capitalist method of procedure, and I am always opposed to it.

THE CHAIRMAN: You desire to be registered as being opposed to receiving this communication as it is worded?

DEL. HANNEMANN: As to the word "proxy" being contained therein as meaning proxy. But if it is understood that this comrade whose name is inserted there is to be an alternate, which means that the original delegate will no more represent that organization in this convention, then I am satisfied, if it is the consensus of opinion that we take it that way so there cannot be any come-back on us later on.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection?

DEL. CRONIN: You bet there is. I cannot understand why this should be brought up again. There was a request made here to transfer the vote, I believe, of Bro. Reid to Bro. Veal, and this convention voted at that time that they would not accept any such procedure. Here is a brother representing an organization, I believe, from Pittsburg. Here is a local union in Chicago wants the Pittsburg brother to represent that union in the absence of the regular delegate. My contention is, Mr. Chairman, that it would be an injustice to this convention to stand for such a procedure. It would not be so bad if Bro. Markley represented a Chicago local, but he does not. This local is here in this city, and the convention is here, and if a brother is to represent it here, why not let the union send another man and send one of their own membership to represent them in this organization? I for one am opposed to such a procedure of transferring a vote from a Chicago delegate to a Pittsburg delegate.

DEL. TULLAR: We disregard geographical lines as separating the working class, and inasmuch as Bro. Markley was before that local 167 last Saturday night and they have all got acquainted with him,

they have a right to select him as their alternate or proxy, whichever way you want to call it, if they choose.

DEL. HAVER: That is not the only case of the kind. I believe there are several members here that represent different cities. Bro. French represents a local in New York and also one in Paterson, N. J. There is no use to split hairs over that or we will have to start all over in this convention. I believe there are one or two other delegates who represent different cities.

DEL. SIMS: I am here representing different cities, and there has been no kick on me.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair understands that the objection is made on this ground; that the transfer has been made after the delegates have been seated, and they took a stand and the convention went on record by a very large vote that they objected in the first case that we had, which was Del. Spear, to transferring her vote to Del. Veal, and they opposed it by a very large vote, and it is on that ground that they now make the protest.

DEL. SCHWEINBURG: The case of Spear has nothing to do with the case of Bros. Veal and Markley, Del. Spear went out of the convention and has given her proxy or alternate to Bro. Veal without any consent of their local union.

DEL. MOSKOVITZ: That is the point.

DEL. SCHWEINBURG: And here is Bro. Shurtleff going back to his local union. He has to go back so as not to lose his job, but he is not to be deprived of his right to represent his local union. The votes his local union had can be given to a proxy. Why should we deprive him of the right to represent his local union? It is splitting hairs and only taking the time of the convention. If the local union should send a letter here authorizing Mr. Hannemann to represent them Mr. Hannemann would not object. I state that that local union 158 in the city of Chicago has got a right to select anybody to represent it on the floor of the convention in case it wished to.

DEL. McKINNON: As far as I can see, the argument is on the word "proxy." I do not see why this convention cannot eliminate that word "proxy" and put in "alternate." I do not see why Markley cannot represent that local if the members of that local see fit to have him represent them here, and I make a motion to change the word "proxy" to "alternate." (Seconded.)

DELEGATES: Unanimous consent.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you make that as an amendment?

DEL. McKINNON: As an amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN: I did not know that there was a motion before the house, and for that reason there is nothing to amend—though you might amend some of this talk.

DEL. FOX: Then I move as an amendment to the motion just made that we seat the comrade.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you want to change that motion now?

DEL. McKINNON: Yes, I change it to a motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is that the word "proxy" be changed to "alternate."

DEL. McKINNON: Yes, and that the delegate be seated and given that vote.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is that seconded?

A DELEGATE: Second.

THE CHAIRMAN: That the delegate be seated. You have heard the motion; are you ready for the question? (Question called for.) Is there a roll call wanted?

DELEGATES: No.

DEL. CRONIN: I do not want a roll call. I consider this a violation of the constitution, and I want to be recorded as being opposed to it.

A DELEGATE: Shut up.

DEL. CRONIN: I can be as nasty as you can, if you want to make any fuss.

THE CHAIRMAN: I don't like to hear a delegate say to another shut up, and then cry out for free speech. Everybody has a right to his opinion, and I concede that those that are the most opposed to me have a right to voice their sentiments. I don't want to hear that any more. It does not look well. It is not organizing the working class. We have got to get close together. Do you have anything more to say?

DEL. CRONIN: I only say I want to be recorded as voting against it. I believe I can be recorded as voting against it.

THE CHAIRMAN: I believe this is going to be very nearly unanimous, and the Chair is trying to push things on this, and I will rule this, that with unanimous consent this will be passed, with the understanding that those who desire to be recorded as opposed to it can do so. I think they can be registered quicker than we could take a roll call. Bro. Cronin desires to be registered as opposed to it.

DEL. McCABE: I desire to be recorded as voting no.

DEL. ST. JOHN: I wish to be recorded no. I don't care whether it is a proxy or alternate, it is a subterfuge.

DEL. McMULLEN: Put me down against.

DEL. KEOGH: We have got to have the proxy business out altogether or the proxies will run the convention, and the next vote you will be outvoted.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let us have a roll call.

The roll call was then taken, but before the announcement of the result—

DEL. DUNCAN: Mr. President, may I ask a question?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

DEL. DUNCAN: I want to ask how it is, on what grounds, the majority of this body here will recognize a proxy from an individual as in the case of Mr. Shurtleff and Mr. Schomberg, which has just been passed on, and refuse to recognize a proxy from a body of men not a local union. I submit to you in that connection that all of our votes are proxies, as the constituents that we represent are not here. They are proxies, whether we call them that or not.

DEL. RUGG: I move that that communication be received and that that brother be seated as a proxy.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is out of order at this time.

DEL. GOLDBERG: I move you, Mr. Chairman—

THE CHAIRMAN: Any motion is out of order at this time.

DEL. CRANSTON: After that vote is announced I want to have the floor on a matter of personal privilege.

The vote was announced as follows: Total vote, 595½; yes, 55½; no, 540.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion has been lost.

DEL. GOLDBERG: I move you that we instruct the Secretary to communicate with that local in Chicago and notify them to that effect; that is, that they should change the word "proxy" to "alternate," and the man would be entitled to a vote.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there a second to that motion? There is no second.



DEL. PARKS: Is there a motion before the house?

THE CHAIRMAN: Not at this time, no.

DEL. PARKS: Now I move you that we seat the brother here as per the request of this Local 187 of Chicago. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair will rule that motion out of order. We have just voted on it.

DEL. PARKS: I rise to a point of order, that it is not proper to rule it out of order. We have not voted upon the question of seating the man. The question that we voted on a while ago was whether we were going to adopt this motion to call a spade a club, whether we were going to change the word "proxy" to "alternate."

DEL. McKINNON: I think my motion covered that.

DEL. PARKS: I voted to call a spade a spade, and did not vote on the question whether we should seat the man as per the request of the Chicago local; that is the way I voted. I voted intelligently. The motion was to call a spade a club, and I voted to call it a spade; that is the way I voted. Now, we have never decided any question granting the request or refusing the request of Local 187, but we simply decided the question whether we were going to call a spade a club.

THE CHAIRMAN: I would like to ask the gentleman that keeps the records here to read that motion.

(The reporter read Del. McKinnon's motion, "that we change the word proxy to alternate.")

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion then would be in order.

DEL. PARKS: All right.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is that we now seat the delegate as per the request of the local union. Are you ready for the question? (Question called for.)

DEL. McCABE: I don't know how you are going to seat that delegate. He has already been seated, and I think that motion is uncalled for. The delegate was seated by the Credential Committee to represent that local. Now, the intention of that communication was to delegate that power to another delegate by proxy, and that local is not connected in that district in any way at all. Now, if you are going to assume that position, then let us all delegate our proxies to one man, and let us all quit and get out of here; that is all.

DEL. COX: Comrade Chairman, a point of order. You stated a while ago when this discussion commenced that there was a motion passed yesterday knocking this proxy business out. I claim that all this is uncalled for, and you should so rule.

DEL. McMULLEN: Do you make that point of order now?

DEL. COX: Yes, I do.

DEL. DUNCAN: I do not think there is any objection to the word "proxy." The motion was to give the vote, and we were not voting on the word "proxy."

THE CHAIRMAN: We will take a vote. The proxy question is to be put to a vote.

DEL. DUNCAN: I am in favor of this motion. It does not matter to me whether it is "proxy" or "credentials" in the request, provided it comes from a body of men, a local union, which is entitled to representation here. We did take action against one delegate giving his vote over to another delegate and the issuing of a proxy in that way, but we have taken no action on the proxies issued by local unions. It would be absurd. We could hold no convention here if we did not recognize such proxies.

DEL. HOLMES: I might also state that the Secretary was instructed to telegraph to any union whose delegates have gone home, in order

that they might write and tell anybody that was here, and they said they objected to telegrams coming from those unions, without a written request with the seal or stamp of the local. That would be unfair. Another thing, you disfranchise this local in Chicago. It is a matter of technicality; it is a distinction without a difference, and I believe we ought to seat Bro. Markley.

DEL. FOX: I think this is a regular credential from a union asking to seat Comrade Markley as a delegate from that union. That is the evident intent. We have recognized others, and their delegates have been seated through them. For instance, we seated a delegate from this so-called Musical Department, and the five votes of that local were all given to Bro. Schomberg, it is true; but there was a suggestion this morning to divide them. But the contention that I make is that this is a regular credential from a union, and this convention cannot legally vote it down.

DEL. HAVER: A point of order.

THE CHAIRMAN: State your point of order.

DEL. HAVER: My point of order is that the previous question has been called for, and we are still debating on it.

THE CHAIRMAN: The previous question has been called for. Are you ready for the question? (Question called for.) Call the roll.

A DELEGATE: What is the question?

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion that is before the house that you are to vote on now is that we will seat the delegate as per request of the local union. Call the roll.

A DELEGATE: No objection.

DEL. CRONIN: I am going to ask, isn't that the same substantially as the other motion? For instance, striking out where it says "proxy" and inserting "alternate?" Isn't that practically the same motion?

THE CHAIRMAN: That is a technical question. Proceed with the roll call.

The roll was then called. At the conclusion—

DEL. McENTOSH: I was out when the roll was called. I wish to be recorded voting yes.

The vote resulted: Total vote, 637; yes, 267; no, 370.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is lost.

#### STATEMENT OF DELEGATE CRANSTON.

DEL. CRANSTON: Mr. Chairman, as I have got to leave here and I have to work, I would like to have the privilege of answering the accusations made here yesterday in a general way. I would like to have the floor for that purpose.

THE CHAIRMAN: If there is no objection. The convention is suffering from overwork of the committees.

DEL. CRANSTON: I will not be over ten minutes.

THE CHAIRMAN: You won't get ten minutes. You can have only five minutes.

DEL. CRANSTON: I just want to speak of the enormous salary I had from the American Labor Union. I do not believe in any month it exceeded \$5. When the American Labor Union was first established in this town there were two men who went to work hard to establish the American Labor Union; that was Tim Mahoney and myself. We worked for that union without any remuneration whatever. I don't know what Mahoney did, as he held a commission from Dan. McDonald. I never held a commission as organizer in the American Labor Union. During the five months that I spent in the American Labor Union it was at the suggestion of the General Secretary-Treasurer at

that time that I receive a commission of 40 cents on the dollar from that union or any other union that I would put in existence, but from no union organized prior to these unions that I would put in existence. The fact of the matter is simply this, as Bro. Riordan will have to acknowledge if he would go over the books of Clarence Smith, that the majority of the money that I received from even my local was turned over for the per capita tax to allow the business agent that they had at that time to draw his salary. I don't believe I drew all told from the American Labor Union \$40, if I drew that sum, in all the time that I worked for them.

There was an accusation made previous to this time that when I first went into office that I was in it as a tool whereby the American Cracker Company got the label to use. The fact of the matter is that all that I had to do with the American Cracker Company was that when McDonald came here and they had organized here with this man Caldwell, I introduced this business agent from the cracker factory, who organized the union, to McDonald—Dan. McDonald—and the three different locals in the cracker industry in this town at that time came together and formed one organization. They had an agreement at that time with the American Federation of labor which lasted for five years, and is still in existence, unless it was changed. I don't believe it has been changed by the I. W. W. But there was never any contract drawn up by the American Labor Union with these people. They worked under their old agreement with the American Federation of Labor. I never attended but two meetings of the cracker makers in my life. One meeting I took the representatives of the U. B. R. E. Who was President at that time, Charley?

THE PRESIDENT: Estes, I believe.

DEL. CRANSTON: George Estes—and Clarence Smith, over to a mass meeting that was held on Halsted street. Another time I went there with Dan. McDonald. Those are the only two times I ever was to the cracker makers' meeting.

Another charge was that I gave the label—though drawing the magnificent salary of \$4 or \$5 a month—gave the label to the clothing maker man Doyle or Coyle, whatever his name is, on Halsted street, down about No. 667. I never was at a meeting of the clothing people in my life, never was at any of their mass meetings, and I believe they never held any meetings, and that was proven beyond a reasonable shadow of a doubt that that matter was transacted in the general office. He advertised this, and it was both in the American Labor Union paper at that time and also in all the A. F. of L. papers. You could go there and get a suit of clothes with the A. F. of L. label on it or you could go and get a suit of clothes with the A. L. U. label on it. I had nothing whatever to do with it.

Now, since the I. W. W. came into existence I went down and worked like a trooper so as to build up the organization. I was to get 10 cents on every 25 cents that was received. I claim it is right. Of course there are organizers that have salaries of \$10, \$20 or \$150 a month, but who don't deliver the goods. I claim that that proposition was made to me, the same proposition that was made to the organizer in New York—10 cents out of every 25 cents. Then if I don't deliver the goods it can't work. That was the proposition I had, that I get 10 cents out of every 25 paid, and if I made anything all right; if I didn't it was because I couldn't work and deliver the goods. My salary run from \$5.00 to \$7.00. I have got receipts for what I turned over, and it runs it up to a rate of paying on one hundred, for about six to nine or twelve months. I guess July was the only time I failed

to pay on one hundred. We always paid in advance, and the magnificent salary I got out of it would average \$10.00 to \$12.50.

There was so much kick and disturbance raised because I got that magnificent salary of \$5.00 to \$7.50 and some months \$12.50, that I thought it was better for me to accept a stipulated salary of \$20.00 a month, which I received for a few months, and when the organization was shut off I was paid off.

Now, about the money that I received from the I. W. W. I went downtown and rented a hall down there with the intention of running it for another party from the central body and of renting to locals. When I go down there the people that had had the hall were out of business. I took the furniture and fixtures and went down and took a lease from the landlady. I later found there was no lease and no property belonging to the landlady. I had to buy the property. I went to both the Secretary and Sherman and explained the situation. They said: "Well, Cranston, go ahead and take the hall, and if you need anything come to us and we will help fix it up." I never got or asked them for a five-cent piece, either one of them. I went to work and for the first five or six months that I ran the hall it cost on an average ten to fifteen dollars a month out of my own pocket. After the Metal and Machinery Department commenced to move in there, then I took the whole thing. I tried to remodel the hall and take the partition out. I was accused by some party of putting a partition in there so as to make another meeting place. The fact of the matter is that it cost \$37.00 to take the partition out of there, and not put it in. I papered the place and put in the light and I charged these locals that were organized in the I. W. W.—and I have got a list here, and I will let Bro. Trautmann see the list—there is the list (extending paper). It cost me \$30.00 a month for that hall, without a thing in it, without a light in it or anything else, and any local of the I. W. W. that wanted to organize down there got that hall at one dollar per night. They made me furnish the light and do the cleaning and repairs of the hall, which I have done ever since. No. 85 is right there now, and they have never paid more than a dollar. Local 60, which Bro. Tuller organized, went in there and went out at the end of two months, and got it at a dollar a night. For every dollar I got from this I. W. W. it has cost me twenty-five dollars—every dollar I ever got in doing work of this kind.

Another thing I might say in a general way: There was no specific charge, understand, but these are general. The list is here; members of the I. W. W. are here. The cigarmakers' local that was organized here had it at one dollar a night. The S. L. P. and the Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance have always had the use of the hall at one dollar a night. Everything that was organized down there has never paid more than a dollar a night—never did, and the highest paid by any of the locals of the Metal and Machinery Departments now is \$1.50 a night.

I must have been an awful grafter when you can't go down and rent a hall for less than \$3.50 a night, every time the door opens.

I understand these are general charges. I cannot answer any specific charge, because there is none. But that is all the money that I have got, all told, out of the I. W. W. Instead of \$1.00 that I got from them I paid \$100.00 into the organization—for every dollar I took out of it. I thank you.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Isn't it a matter of record that I protested and objected against your getting that 10 cents rebate on 25-cent dues collected?

DEL. CRANSTON: Certainly you protested.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Didn't I ask you when the \$20.00 in July was paid, didn't I say, "Cranston, we have so many strikes on hand," and when you were paid the last \$20.00 I said you "were not deserving it." You said, "What do I care about that?" I ask that question.

DEL. CRANSTON: I want to answer the question. When you said that you protested against it I said I didn't care—

DEL. DE LEON: A point of order. We have completed the roll call, and under the rules the only thing in order is to continue the business that had the floor when this convention adjourned yesterday.

DEL. McCABE: Mr. Chairman.

DEL. DE LEON: One moment.

DEL. McMULLEN: A point of order.

THE CHAIRMAN: I will listen to the point of order.

DEL. McMULLEN: Then I will make another point.

DEL. DE LEON: The matter of Cranston is ended; he had the floor and has stated his case, and any further discussion of the transaction is out of order.

DEL. CRANSTON: I would rather answer the question. It is no more than fair to him. He protested.

DEL. DE LEON: I claim that Del. Cranston had the right to the floor on a privileged question, a privileged matter. He stated it and is ready to withdraw. But the discussion indicated by the Secretary-Treasurer is out of order. After Cranston withdraws the only thing is to continue where we left off last evening, and that is the reading of the resolutions. I desire a ruling on that point.

DEL. CRANSTON: Mr. Chairman—well, go ahead and make your ruling.

THE CHAIRMAN: I believe the delegate technically is right.

DEL. DE LEON: Then you are ruling in my favor?

THE CHAIRMAN: As you have adopted rules of order—so I have been informed, I was outside when it was done—I will have to rule in accordance with the delegate who has made the point of order, and this question will close at this time and we will proceed with the regular order of business.

DEL. CRANSTON: Just one more word before that, I will not ask anything more. My boss is in Europe. I work for wages like the rest of the people do. At this time, this week it will be utterly impossible for me to come to the convention. Anybody that knows anything about the real estate business in the fall of the year knows that people are moving out and in. I have to attend to that work, and that is what is keeping me away from the convention. If there is anybody going to refer to this matter I would prefer it to be brought in now rather than bring it in later, like it was before.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you ask to be excused?

DEL. CRANSTON: I ask for the privilege of being away from the convention. I have got a commission business. I will spend as many hours here as I can, but there are matters that I will have to attend to.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are excused, and I will say to you as a delegate that if a case is brought here where you are involved the Chair will rule that it will be out of order until the time that we can get you here.

DEL. CRANSTON: Any time that I can spare an hour or so I will come here.

THE CHAIRMAN: Proceed with the regular order of business.

## RESOLUTIONS.

The following additional resolutions and amendments were submitted, read and referred:

## NO. 15.

Local Union 14, Trans. Dept.,  
Minneapolis, Minn., Sept. 2, 1906.

To the Delegates of the I. W. W. Convention, Chicago, Ill.—Greetings:

Resolved, That we endorse letter from Cincinnati, Ohio, dated July 30, signed by Edward Gardner, that the clause relating to chairman or president, providing that the board may decide whether he shall be elected from the floor at each meeting or act in that capacity during the life of the board, be changed to read that the chairman shall be nominated and elected at each meeting.

FRED. D. HENION,  
Pres. Local 14.

S. L. SEARFUSS,  
Sec'y Local 14 pro tem.

(With seal of union.)

(Referred to Constitution Committee, with instructions to segregate such parts as should go to Education Committee.)

## NO. 16.

From Hotel and Restaurant Workers Local 130, New York, presented by Delegate Fischer.

Resolution for convention, on Education:

Whereas, The membership of the organization should be kept posted on what goes on in the organization and in the labor world at large; and

Whereas, Sound education is necessary to the equipment of the membership in accomplishing the aims of the organization, namely, taking and holding the instruments and products of our toil; therefore be it

Resolved, That every local be urged to give to every member on initiation one year's subscription to the official organ, "The Industrial Worker."

(Education and Literature.)

## NO. 17.

By Delegate Fischer, of Hotel and Restaurant Workers Local 130, New York.

Resolution to convention on "The Industrial Worker."

Whereas, Labor union journal should give definite information as to the progress of the organization, the happenings in the various locals, the movements and plans of the employers, the treacheries of pure and simple labor misleaders, technical and mechanical improvements in the various trades, and other facts of value and interest to the membership; and

Whereas, Such a journal should also contain articles on scientific working class economics in order to prepare the membership for their final and speedy emancipation from wage slavery; therefore be it

Resolved, That the editorial management of "The Industrial Worker" be instructed to embody more of the above stated classes of matter in the columns of that paper, thus making it a real educational medium; and

Whereas, The membership of the I. W. W. is composed of workers speaking different languages; and

Whereas, Every man can best express his ideas in his own language; therefore be it

## INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD.

Resolved, That the management of "The Industrial Worker" be instructed to set aside a few pages for correspondence in different languages.

(Committee on Constitution.)

### NO. 18.

Colorado Springs, Colo.

At a regular meeting of Local No. 237, I. W. W., held Sept. 5, 1906, after thorough discussion a committee consisting of J. W. Gerry, Wm. Schlessinger and I. P. Buck were elected to draft a resolution on the striking element of the I. W. W. to be given to our delegate to the convention, Ludwig Ginther, to be there presented for adoption or rejection.

As the I. W. W. was organized previously for the gathering together of the workers into a class-conscious revolutionary body, prepared, when the time is ripe for the collapse of capitalism, to take over and run the machinery of production, in the interest of all the workers, and not to inaugurate strikes to materially benefit a handful of workers here and there in this broad land; at this early period of the inception of this grand organization while many locals throughout the land are struggling manfully to keep their organizations afloat, these constant solicitations for assistance from striking brothers is a serious drawback to a healthy growth.

We are cognizant of the fact that the workers as a class can not materially benefit themselves under the present economic system, and only by its complete overthrow can the workers ever expect to obtain complete economic justice.

So long as the present capitalistic system obtains the natural tendency will be to lower the standard of living of the workers as a class.

Therefore be it resolved, That in convention assembled the delegates to the convention of the I. W. W. will formulate some rules and regulations governing strikes, so that the locals throughout the land may be governed thereby and not be at the mercy of workers who go on a strike solely to materially benefit themselves with no thought of the good of the organization as a whole.

And be it further resolved, That at this time no strike should be inaugurated unless the conditions are decidedly unbearable and the remuneration inadequate to keep the worker in good working shape and able to propagate his kind, which is all the workers can expect, and positively all they will get under the present industrial system.

(Signed) W. J. GERRY, Ch'm'n of Com.,

WM. SCHLESSINGER,

I. P. BUCK,

JAS. W. STEVENSON, Fin. Sec. Treas.,

Local 237, I. W. W.

(Seal of union.)

(Committee on Constitution.)

### NO. 19.

Belleville, Ill., Industrial Worker Union Local No. 162. Resolutions and amendments accepted by Local Belleville, to be handed in at the convention:

No. 1. Resolved, That all International Industrial Departments shall hereafter be known simply as Industrial Departments.

No. 2. A list of all the secretaries of the I. W. W. shall be printed at least every six months, with date and place of meeting, and one copy of same shall be forwarded to each local. This to also include the Departments.

No. 3. Resolved, That the convention take up the matter of issuing or adopting an out-of-work stamp, and locals shall grant same to brothers out of work and in sickness to such brothers as they see fit and worthy of same.

No. 4. Resolved, That ritual be abolished.

No. 5. Resolved, That the organizers shall be paid wages which shall be based on the average wages paid the worker in the Industrial Department he belongs to.

No. 6. Resolved, That an Auditing Committee of three be elected at the convention, the brothers of committee not to have any salaried offices of any local or department. Books examined every three or six months, and financial account and statement of same to be sent to each local union.

No. 7. Resolved, That the label be abolished.

No. 8. Resolved, That the office of General President be abolished.

No. 9. Resolved, That the officers of the I. W. W. shall be a General Secretary-Treasurer and a General Executive Board composed of the General Secretary-Treasurer of each Industrial Department. The headquarters of all the Industrial Departments and general headquarters to be in one building, thereby placing the Executive Board so they can meet and transact business at any and all times.

No. 10. Resolved, That all unions and departments are to use the name of the I. W. W. as laid down in the constitution, discarding any other name they may have that is not in conformity with same, and also to use none but the I. W. W. seal.

No. 11. Resolved, That no agreement be entered into by members of any local or organization with their employers.

No. 12. Resolved, That there be but one fund (the general fund), doing away with the defense fund, and all moneys for defense and maintaining the organization shall come from General fund. All moneys to be placed in a deposit box instead of bank as heretofore provided for on page 9.

No. 13. There should be no fees for charter for Industrial Council, nor any dues.

WALTER GOSS, Rec. Sec. I. W. W. Local 162.

(Committee on Constitution.)

#### NO. 20.

To the Officers and Delegates of the Second Annual Convention of the I. W. W.

The following resolution is presented by the delegates of the Silk Workers Industrial Union Local No. 176, I. W. W.:

Resolved, That the second paragraph of the Preamble of the I. W. W. read as follows:

"Between these two classes a struggle must go on until all the toilers come together on the industrial field, and take and hold that which they produce by their labor, through an economic organization of the working class, without affiliation with any political party."

Respectfully submitted

JOSEPH MULLADY,

MICHAEL DUMAS,

Silk Workers Industrial Union Local 176.

(Committee on Constitution.)

#### NO. 21.

Whereas, It is evident that the revolutionary principles of Industrial Economic organization is penetrating the minds of the workers, and



Whereas, We know that the Jewish-speaking wage slaves have been neglected in this educational work,

Therefore we request that the second annual convention of the I. W. W. place a Jewish national organizer in the field whose mission shall be to bring this message to the Jewish-speaking wage workers of this continent in helping to rally these workers to the accomplishment of the social revolution.

From Locals 38, 61, 161, 284, New York.

S. MOSKOVITZ.

(Committee on Organization.)

#### NO. 22.

Resolved, That it is the sense of this convention that in the event of a new delay of the trial of our brothers, Moyer, Haywood and Pettibone, or in the event of an unjustified sentence in their case, the national headquarters of the I. W. W. shall immediately proceed to call a general strike and use every possible means and all the funds at its command in order to assert the right of the working class to resist and overcome the violence of the masters.

TEOFILO PETRIELLA.

(Committee on Strikes and Grievances.)

#### NO. 23.

Whereas, For the facilitating of the purposes of organization locally and the easier working between headquarters and localities, be it

Resolved, That provision be made for a Provisional Industrial Council for not less than four unions until such time as it shall grow to the numbers provided for in the constitution.

Submitted by Local 198, Toronto, Ont.

JAMES M. REID, Delegate.

(Committee on Constitution.)

#### NO. 24.

Whereas, The capitalist class being quick to see anything which threatens their class interest; and

Whereas, Through the actions of the police in various cities in the United States and Canada in suppressing the street propaganda of revolutionary industrial unionism, it is shown that the capitalist material interests scent danger; therefore be it

Resolved, That a fund be provided by the organization for the purpose of fighting a set case, providing that the full power of the organization be used to make it a means of propaganda to the proletariat.

Submitted by Local 198, Toronto, Can.

JAMES M. REID, Delegate.

(Committee on Ways and Means.)

#### NO. 25.

Whereas, It is evident that industrial unionism is receiving the approval of wage workers of all nationalities; and

Whereas, The Jewish press has ignored this revolutionary industrial organization; therefore be it

Resolved, That the convention take steps in establishing a Jewish paper, and that until the establishment of such press we endorse and support financially and otherwise all such Jewish papers as have loyally supported and are supporting this revolutionary economic organization.

S. MOSKOVITZ, L. U. 38, 61, 161, 284,

Delegate from New York.

(Committee on Education and Literature.)

## NO. 26.

To the Second Annual Convention Industrial Workers of the World:

Whereas, The food stuff industry bears an important relation to the working class interests as well as to the destiny of society as a whole, and

Whereas, Any revolutionary organization of the workers is dependent upon this industry in the relation of a basis of supplies, and

Whereas, The Industrial Workers of the World have neglected this important industry to the great disadvantage of our present deliberations;

Therefore be it resolved, That this convention find ways and means to immediately launch a campaign of agitation and organization to the end that the revolutionary seed of working class action may be sown and its harvest garnered from the ranks of food-stuff workers.

Respectfully submitted,

E. J. FOOTE,

Delegate from Bakery Workers' Industrial Union No. 224, Wichita, Kansas.

(Committee on Ways and Means.)

## NO. 27.

Whereas, On Sept. 28, pursuant to instructions from the Executive Board, a strike was called by Tobacco Workers Union Local 89 of Cleveland, Ohio, and an appeal issued by the Executive Board for funds to support said strike. The returns in reply to said appeal were very meager, and, recognizing the gravity of the situation, Wm. E. Trautmann, secretary-treasurer, was called to Cleveland to investigate the situation. Upon his recommendation, seeing that victory was in immediate prospect if funds could be raised on the spot to tide the men over, authority was given the strike committee to raise a loan in the name of the Executive Board, Trautmann giving his note payable after six months for \$1,000 to secure said loan. One thousand one hundred and seventy-eight dollars was thus raised, which was afterward paid out in strike benefits. Of this amount \$363 has been repaid by the Executive Board by an agreement entered into, but the remainder, \$815, is still due. The creditors, all of them poor men, are demanding payment.

Therefore, Union 89, through its representative, requests the convention to order payment of the amount due.

SOL. ROTKOVITZ.

(Committee on Ways and Means.)

## NO. 28.

From Tobacco Workers Union No. 89, Cleveland.

Cleveland, O., Sept. 13, 1906.

The following resolution was adopted by Local 89, I. W. W., the delegate of said local to bring it before the convention at Chicago, Ill., Sept. 17, 1906:

First. That all members of the I. W. W. be assessed one dollar for the purpose of starting strike fund, and ratio of per capita tax to be paid into the fund as per constitution. The money not to be used for any other purpose but strike or lockout fund.

Second. Resolved, That the wording on the label be changed from "Tobacco and Cigar Industry" to "Tobacco Industry."

SOL. ROTKOVITZ.

(Committee on Ways and Means.)

## NO. 29.

Be it resolved, That the official journal be published weekly.

Be it further resolved, That the official journal and all journals of departments or sub-divisions connected with the I. W. W. be subject to and controlled by the G. E. B.

A. L. SMITH,

Orleans Industrial Union No. 38.

(Committee on Education and Literature.)

## NO. 30.

Whereas, There are wage slaves of Macedonian descent in good numbers throughout Canada; and

Whereas, They are desirous of becoming acquainted with the principles of revolutionary industrial unionism; and

Whereas, Their ignorance of the English language precludes their receiving the principles of revolutionary industrial unionism; be it

Resolved, That the organization of the I. W. W. take steps as soon as possible to provide literature in the Macedonian language.

Submitted by Local 198, Toronto,  
JAMES M. REID, Delegate.

(Committee on Education and Literature.)

No. 31, Amendments proposed by Cincinnati locals, MISSING.

(Education Committee.)

## NO. 32.

Recommendation: That no department be organized and chartered by the Industrial Workers of the World unless the local unions which would comprise such department have, and are paying a per capita tax on, a membership of at least two thousand.

JOHN RIORDAN.

(Committee on Constitution.)

## NO. 33.

The first sentence of our Preamble of the I. W. W. reads, "The working class and the employing class have nothing in common." Again, our motto proclaims "Labor is entitled to all it produces."

I therefore recommend that before nominating and electing any member to an office in the I. W. W. or officers of local unions to any position in our organization, no matter how simple it may appear, great care be taken that the candidate thoroughly understand and absolutely believe in the above.

JOHN RIORDAN.

(Committee on Constitution.)

## NO. 34.

Whereas, The office of president is a part of the equipment of a capitalist political state, the chief functions of which are to assert the "rights of property" and to restrain and oppress and murder the working class; and

Whereas, We have found the office of president expensive in our first year's history; and

Whereas, The work of organizing the working class and of administering their affairs can all be done by our organizers and secretaries and their subsidiary officers; therefore be it

Resolved, That the office of president be abolished in the Industrial Workers of the World.

Fraternally submitted by

C. H. DUNCAN,  
L. U. 222, Spokane.

## NO. 34½.

Whereas, The office of "president" is a part of the equipment of a capitalist political state, the chief functions of which are to assert the "rights of property" and to restrain and oppress and murder the working class; and

Whereas, We have found the office of president expensive in our first year's history; and

Whereas, The work of organizing the working class and of administering their affairs can all be done by our organizers and secretaries and their subsidiary officers; therefore be it

Resolved, That the office of president be abolished in the Industrial Workers of the World.

Fraternally submitted by

C. H. DUNCAN,  
L. U. 222, Spokane.

## NO. 35 TO 37½.

By Duncan, Spokane. MISSING.

(All ref. to Constitution Com.)

## NO. 38.

From M. & M. Dept., Milwaukee. MISSING.

## NO. 39.

Whereas, We do not wish the I. W. W. to fall, like the tower of Babel, through a confusion of tongues; and

Whereas, The word Comrade is rightly applied to our fellows in a militant or destructive movement, such as an army or a working class political party; and

Whereas, The word "gentleman" is, properly, germane to the affairs of the English nobility; therefore be it

Resolved, That we discontinue the use of the word "gentleman" in addressing each other, that we may not have the appearance of offering each other insult, and of the word "comrade" that we may relieve ourselves from the necessity of calling those who are not our comrades by a term of unwarranted endearment; and be it further

Resolved, That we shall be known to each other as "brothers" and "sisters," which are the right words in any constructive society, and that we recommend this usage to the entire working class.

Fraternally submitted by

C. H. DUNCAN,  
Representing Local Union 222, Spokane, Wash.

(Constitution Committee.)

## NO. 40.

From Local 372, Patton, Pa.

Com. on Organization.

## NO. 41.

From Aug. Bickmeyer, St. Louis.

Com. on Organization.

BOTH MISSING.

## NO. 42.

To the Officers and Delegates of the Second Annual Convention of the I. W. W.:

We, the delegates to this convention representing Local No. 176, resolve that when a strike is duly sanctioned by the Executive Board, that the secretary-treasurer have the power to forward strike benefit without waiting for the consent of the other members of the Executive Board.

Respectfully submitted,

JOSEPH MULLADY,  
MICHAEL DUMAS.

(Committee on Organization.)

## NO. 43.

Presented by Del. Wade Parks.

Article II, Section 3, should be changed to read: "All money held in general fund of local union shall be the property of local union and used at discretion of local union. A local may pay sick or death benefit from general fund if so desired by a majority of the members."

Article IX, Section 1, should be changed to read: "That withdrawal cards may be granted to members in good standing who may not be satisfied with the I. W. W."

R. A. FULLER,  
J. F. CASE,  
MARTIN PENNY,  
Committee, Local 250.

(Committee on Constitution.)

## NO. 44.

Introduced by Del. Wade Parks, 267, 370, 637.

Whereas, We are here assembled in the second I. W. W. annual convention for the purpose of carrying forward the work of organizing the workers of this country into a working class movement that shall have for its purpose the emancipation of the working class from the slave bondage of capitalism; and

Whereas, The aims and objects of this organization should be to put the working class in possession of the economic means of life and in control of the machinery of production and distribution, without regard to capitalist masters; and

Whereas, It has been declared "There is no man who has an ounce of honesty in his makeup but recognizes the fact that there is a continuous struggle between the two classes," and this organization will be formed, based and founded on the class struggle, having in view no compromise and no surrender, and but one object and one purpose, and that is to bring the workers of this country into the possession of the full value of the product of their toil; and

Whereas, We are the duly organized convention of the Industrial Workers of the World, organized for the purpose of accomplishing the above revolutionary program; and

Whereas, Constitutions are only the products of, have their rise and spring from revolutionary movements and are made to accomplish the purpose and objects of said revolutionary movements; and

Whereas, The purpose and objects of the I. W. W. are more specifically defined by the Manifesto which is the cornerstone of the future Co-operative Commonwealth, and the Preamble is the guiding star to the goal; therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the second annual convention of the I. W. W., have the full sovereign power to make such constitutional alterations by way of amendment, suspension or abolition of the constitution wherein and wherever we find that the said constitution obstructs, hinders or tends in any degree to defeat the purposes and objects of this revolutionary movement as outlined in the Manifesto, our cornerstone, and the Preamble, our guiding star. Be it further

Resolved, That this convention's acts and deliberations should be judged and interpreted not by the literal interpretation of any constitutional enactment, but according to the spirit and in the light of the aforesaid purposes as expressed in the Manifesto, Preamble and Wm. D. Haywood's opening address in what he termed the first Continental Congress of the Working Class.

(Committee on Resolutions.)

NO. 45. Chicago, Sept. 25, 1906.

To the Delegates of the Second Annual Convention of the I. W. W.:

I hereby certify that Local 309, Printers and Bookbinders, favors the doing away with the office of president of this organization; also the abolition of the label.

FRED. G. MOORE.

(Committee on Constitution.)

NO. 46.

Resolution adopted by Local No. 12, Los Angeles, Cal., Sept. 14, 1906, presented by Delegate Holmes.

Whereas, There exists today an open conflict between the capitalist class aided and abetted by the Allied Printing Trades Council of Tonopah and Goldfield mining districts and the A. F. of L. in general upon one side and the I. W. W. backed and assisted by the W. F. M., the Mining Department of the I. W. W. of the above-mentioned districts; therefore be it

Resolved, That Local 12 of Los Angeles, in regular meeting assembled, heartily endorses the actions of the I. W. W. and the W. F. M. in the above-mentioned conflict, and that we deplore the existence of such an organization which claims to represent the cause of labor, whose members are taught and forced to scab upon their fellow workers, as was done by the A. F. of L. in Goldfield against the poor struggling newsboys, who sell the boycotted sheet, by name the Tonopah Sun, and that the capitalist class- and un-class-conscious organization the A. F. of L. did associate and join hands with the gang of hired thugs, assassins and would-be gun men of the capitalists in their efforts to intimidate and bluff the I. W. W. membership; and be it further

Resolved, That we, Local 12 of Los Angeles, do hereby offer all moral and financial support within our power, and that copies of these resolutions be forwarded to our delegate in Chicago, the I. W. W. paper and the Miners' Magazine for publication, and the same be spread upon the records of this meeting.

MIKE BRADY, Sec'y.

(Seal of Union.)

(Committee on Resolutions.)

NO. 47.

To the Officers and Members of the Second Annual Convention of the I. W. W., held at Chicago, Ill., September, 1906.

Dear Comrades:

Bingham Industrial Union No. 93, I. W. W., would respectfully ask you to legislate the following:

1st. To have one general constitution to govern the Order and all departments or sub-departments.

2nd. The label to be used by the working class and not be given to the master class to speculate on.

3rd. There should be a red label and no other color.

4th. That general by-laws should make provision for paying benefits to the sick after the first week's sickness, and funeral benefits, viz.: The weekly benefits should be one-half of the annual dues, and funeral benefits should be not less than \$50 nor more than \$100.

5th. Local organizers should not be employed for more than 30 days at one time.

6th. Per capita tax should be universal, whether in the general organization or in departments, until the respective departments have 10,000 members, when the per capita tax should be  $8\frac{1}{3}$  cents per member.

Sincerely and fraternally,

CHAS. L. COUNTRYMAN, Sec. and Treas.

AUGUST LUND, Rec. Sec'y.

(Committee on Constitution.)

Bingham Industrial Union 93.

## NO. 48.

Delegates and Fellow Workers:

Greeting—

We, the duly-elected officers in behalf of the members of Local No. 27 of Blacksmiths and Helpers, do protest against the action of the Committee on Credentials in not seating their local delegates for this reason.

We do not believe that the failure of an officer of a local or department or any other organization working under the Industrial Workers of the World to perform his duties as the law and usage provide should deprive such other members of their constitutional rights.

In our case we can prove that it was directly due to the failure of an officer in performing his duty that this local was not in good standing on August 1, 1906.

We enter this protest especially for the purpose of establishing a rule for further use in similar cases.

Cordially yours for Industrial Unionism,

JOHN NYHOLM, President.

E. S. PAYMENT, Cor. Sec'y.

(Constitution Committee.)

## NO. 49.

Local Union No. 125,

Denver, Colo., Aug. 26, 1906.

Chas. O. Sherman, General President,

Chicago, Ill.

Fellow Worker:

At our regular meeting held Aug. 9, 1906, Local No. 125, I. W. W., endorsed Bro. Wm. D. Haywood for Governor of Colorado. There being some doubt in the minds of a very few of our members as to the correctness of our action, the following motion was made, seconded and carried: "That the advice and sanction of the General Executive Board be asked in regard to the action taken by this local endorsing Bro. Wm. D. Haywood for Governor." And as I see by your letterheads that the members are located in four different parts of the United States and British Columbia, how should we go about it to get the advice and sanction of said board, and what action would you advise in the matter?

Fraternally yours,

J. T. FRARY, Cor. and Rec. Sec.

(REPLY.)

Chicago, Aug. 30, 1906.

Mr. J. T. Frary,

Denver, Colo.

Dear Sir and Fellow Worker:

Yours of the 26th to hand and contents noted. In reply to your communication bearing on the question of your local union endorsing the nomination of Bro. W. D. Haywood for Governor of Colorado, from the fact that your union is divided as to the wisdom of such action and that you desire a ruling, or advice, from the Executive Board of the I. W. W., I beg to inform you and your members that the Executive Board will meet at the headquarters on Sept. 10, 1906, and will refer your communication to them for action, and you will be immediately notified of the same.

Trusting this will meet with the entire satisfaction of your union,  
I am

Fraternally yours,

General President, I. W. W.

(Committee on Resolutions.)

THE CHAIRMAN: I would like to state that this communication (No. 49) was brought before the Executive Board, and it was by unanimous consent turned over to the convention, and I refer it to the Resolutions Committee.

NO. 50.

From Local 178, Seattle. MISSING.  
(Constitution Com.)

NO. 51.

From Local 169, Tacoma, Wash. MISSING.  
(Constitution Com. and Organization Com.)

NO. 52.

Salt Lake City, Utah,  
Sept. 7th, 1906.

To the Officers and Members of the Second Annual Convention of the Industrial Workers of the World, held at Chicago, Ill.

We have instructed the delegate from Utah: to advocate these three following changes in the constitution.

1st. The abolishment of the label.

2nd. The abolishment of the ritual.

3d. That a uniform compensation be paid to all secretaries of local unions, who perform this duty every meeting.

Wishing our grand organization every success,

Sincerely and fraternally,

GEORGE E. POATE,

Secretary-Treasurer of Local No. 202, I. W. W., Salt Lake City, Utah.  
(Committee on Constitution.)

NO. 53.

Whereas, It is clear by the reports of our officers that the funds will not permit sending out organizers and keeping them in the field.

Whereas, It is important that the I. W. W. have as many organizers in the different departments as well as general organizers; therefore be it

Resolved, That the wages of the organizers shall not be more than three dollars per day and expenses, said expenses not to be more than three dollars per day and railroad fare. Be it further

Resolved, That these resolutions be sent to a vote of all members of the I. W. W., Railroad Department, M. and M. Department and W. F. M., and if carried, same to take effect at once.

A. LINGENFELTER.

(Committee on Organization.)

NO. 54.

To the Delegates of the Second National Convention, Industrial Workers of the World, Chicago, Ill.

Comrades:

The tailors of the city of New York, considering that they have started only recently to organize industrially, and that they had to keep a hard fight against the employers and the A. F. of L., whose organizers have even resorted to the Jesuitic weapons of slander and misrepresentation in order to disrupt our organization, which is prevented from sending delegates to voice and sustain their views and propositions before the convention.

If, however, their financial means do not allow them to send their representatives, still they have not ceased to think of and work for their organization, so that after a long and careful discussion Local 199



has charged the writer to propose in a letter to the convention the following modifications of the constitution:

1. In page 8, Section 3 (Italian edition), we find the following passage:

"It is understood that the said Executive Committee and the members at large shall at any time be submitted to the General Executive Committee I. W. W."

In other words, this means an unconditional submission to the decisions and resolutions of the General Executive Committee. Now, we do fully recognize that the said committee should have a certain authority conferred on it by the fact that it represents the general address and attitude of the I. W. W. as expressed by the whole organization that elected the same committee; but an unconditional submission would deny to the locals, etc., the right to be considered as reliable and discussing bodies.

We, therefore, in order to eliminate this inconvenience, propose a variation in said expression, so as to bring a radical change according to the reasons expressed above.

2. Page 9, Section 1, officers, etc. We propose the abolition of the presidency, and suggest that the money now used to support the said office be turned to the support of organizers in foreign languages, to be elected by foreign-speaking locals by means of a referendum vote. The I. W. W. holding that the workingman is entitled to the full product of his labor, tends as a final aim to the abolition of the private ownership and the establishment of the Co-operative Commonwealth. It is then obvious that the labor union must gradually absorb in itself the functions of the state, and in such case we see that the functions of the President would become an obstacle, in so far as it would tend to gradually transform the executive power into a directing one—which would be a repetition of the mistake made by the A. F. of L.

3. As to the rules concerning the convention, we believe that Section 3, providing for one delegate for every 4,000 members, is contrary to the elementary principles of revolutionary unionism, and we therefore propose that two delegates be permitted to each and every local, regardless of the number of its members, with the understanding that the votes be counted in proportion to the number of members represented.

LOCAL 199, NEW YORK.  
Per ALBERTO REGENTINI.

(Committee on Constitution.)

NO. 55.

Philadelphia, Sept. 11, 1906.

Mr. W. E. Trautmann.

Dear Comrade:

I wish to inform you that Local No. 344 has decided in the last meeting to amalgamate with the former Brotherhood Union No. 106, as an **independent organization**.

This was the only way to separate that union from the American Federation of Labor. I think it will take several months before you will hear from us.

If you should have to present any claims against this union as regards books and charter, please inform at your earliest convenience.

With fraternal greetings,

FRED GROSSE, Secretary.

SEC. TRAUTMANN (translating): This is a communication in German from the Butcher Workmen's Union in Philadelphia, which was chartered only recently, and they announce that, acting upon advice, they found it necessary to withdraw from the I. W. W. for the time being so as to perfect an amalgamation with another and larger organization, and they want to have instructions how to proceed.

(Referred to Committee on Organization.)

(Del. Duncan in the chair.)

#### NO. 56.

Mr. W. E. Trautmann,  
Chicago, Ill.

Silk Workers Industrial Union No. 190.  
Brooklyn, N. Y., Sept. 8, 1906.

Dear Brother:

I am sorry to notify you that the strike of the members of Local 336 in Glendale has been lost. The organization, consisting of 200 men and women, is busted. The only reason was that the strikers did not get enough support. The married men could not live on \$5 and \$6 a week after having been on strike for twelve long weeks. The loss of that strike is a very hard blow for all the other silk locals; yet we showed the bosses that we can put up a hard fight if necessary. However, there is no use to complain about spilt milk. We learned a good lesson out of this strike, and for the benefit of our organization let me make some suggestions.

We must have a good defense fund. We understand very well that if we are properly organized, then we don't need money to fight the bosses; but at present we must have money to organize us properly. There was a good revolutionary spirit among the strikers in Glendale, but nobody can live on spirit. The wives and the little ones at home cry for bread; they want to fill their empty stomachs though they are used to starvation ever since. We received from you during that strike \$450. There were more than 200 men and women on strike. Figure it out how far those \$450 will go. Local 190 assessed for twelve weeks each member 10 per cent of their wages. We also went to other organizations, even the A. F. of L. unions, to beg for money, and thus we were able to pay about \$7,500 during the twelve weeks. We have very good, active men in Local 190 who did not hesitate to spend each and every night during those twelve weeks to beg for money wherever there was a chance; but take it for granted that I for one will no more go to an A. F. of L. union and ask for money to support our strikes. If the membership of the I. W. W. has not enough feeling of solidarity to support those few men, then I do not think it is worth while to work for it. What was the reason that we lost the Tremont silk strike; what was the reason that we lost the Star ribbon and the Staten Island strike. No support. The same thing happens at present in New York again. The members of Local 176 are sick and tired of paying 5 and 10 per cent assessments, and in a short time the strike will go to the wall if the strikers get no relief. At present the Brooklyn local 190 continues to pay 5 per cent assessment to support the locked-out silk workers of the Empire Ribbon Co. and to support the Glendale strikers who are blacklisted. But if we have to continue to pay so high an assessment I predict that the end of Local 190 will soon be here. I hope that this question will be thoroughly discussed and regulated at the coming convention, and if you think it proper you may read this letter before the convention to give the delegates an example why we lose our strikes.

Yours for industrial unionism,

ALFRED HUETTNER,

Cor. Sec'y. Local 190, I. W. W.

(Seal of Union.)

(Committee on Organization.)

## NO. 57.

Brotherhood of the Daily Life,  
St. Louis, Sept. 11, 1906.

W. E. Trautmann, Gen. Sec.,  
Chicago, Ill.

Dear Sir and Brother:

At a public meeting, held on the 19th of August, the Brotherhood of the Daily Life was requested to arrange for a public discussion on the respective merits of the Industrial Workers of the World and the American Federation of Labor.

Representatives from both organizations were present, and all seemed anxious to have this matter publicly discussed.

I have been instructed, as secretary pro tem, to write and request your organization to send an exponent of your phase of unionism to this debate, which will take place at the hall of the Brotherhood of the Daily Life, 1418 St. Charles street, Sunday, Oct. 7, 3 P. M.

I was also instructed to notify the Central Council of the I. W. W. of this city anent this move.

Favorable action and reply on your part will greatly oblige the Brotherhood of the Daily Life and

Yours sincerely,

JAMES ALLMAN, Sec. pro tem.

(Committee on Ways and Means.)

## NO. 58.

Chicago, Sept. 14, 1906.

To the I. W. W. Convention, 1906, Chicago, Ill.

To whom it may concern:

Not wishing to cast any reflections upon the I. W. W. or its officers we take the liberty of calling your attention to the accompanying statements of the Transportation Department and Local No. 26 of the Transportation Department, I. W. W., which are long past due. The Transportation Department statements, you will notice, include bills dated back as far as August 15, 1905. We wish to impress upon you that our financial standing does not permit us, which your general secretary-treasurer is aware of, to carry accounts for such length of time. We therefore ask you to pass some order that will enable us to collect the amounts due us at the earliest possible moment.

Although we have applied time and again to the before-named bodies for settlement of these accounts we have up to this time not received any encouragement from either one.

Thanking you for past favors.

Yours respectfully,

GALITZ & PABST.

P.S. Notice of this action has also been duly served to both parties.

Chicago, Sept. 14, 1906.

Mr. W. E. Trautmann.

Dear Sir:—

Herewith is communication and statement of the account of the Transportation Department and Local No. 26, Transportation Department, I. W. W., as they stand today. Kindly bring same before the convention body of the I. W. W. of 1906 in view of bringing these accounts to a settlement, and oblige.

Respectfully,

GALITZ & PABST.

Chicago, Sept. 14, 1906.

Teamsters' and Helpers Local No. 26, Transportation Dept., I. W. W.

May 18.	To bill rendered.....	\$ 3.35
May 25.	" " " .....	1.25
May 28.	" " " .....	2.50
May 7.	" " " .....	4.50

\$11.60

Sept. 14, 1906.

Transportation Department, I. W. W.

Aug. 15, 1905.	To bill rendered .....	\$ 1.50
Sept. 7.	" " " .....	18.50
Sept. 11.	" " " .....	6.85
Sept. 21.	" " " .....	1.50
Sept. 21.	" " " .....	3.50
Oct. 4.	" " " .....	14.50
Oct. 7.	" " " .....	5.00
Oct. 7.	" " " .....	1.50
Oct. 20.	" " " .....	16.50
Nov. 14.	" " " .....	1.50
Jan. 10, 1906.	" " " .....	16.50
Jan. 23.	" " " .....	6.25

\$93.60

(Committee on Grievances.)

NO. 59.

From Cigarmakers' Local Union 158, Denver. Missing.

(Committee on Ways and Means.)

NO. 60.

Whereas, There has already been considerable disputing and dissension on account of financial affairs within the I. W. W., and,

Whereas, We are a democratic organization and we believe that so far as possible all should fare alike, be it

Resolved, That all paid employees of the I. W. W., including the General Secretary and all organizers, shall receive the same pay.

Fraternally submitted by

C. H. DUNCAN,

Representing Local Union 222, Spokane, Wash.

(Committee on Constitution.)

NO. 61.

Steubenville, Ohio.

Mr. W. E. Trautmann,  
Chicago, Ill.

Dear Sir:

While down in Pittsburg, speaking at some lodge, I was asked by several puddlers if I could see my way clear to organize them into a union for puddlers only, as they are greatly dissatisfied with the Amalgamated Association, and won't pay into it. In fact, they wanted me to take steps at once and start up some other union.

I advised them to go slow in the matter and I would get in touch with the I. W. W. and see what could be done about getting a charter, and that assistance you would render them in the matter of organizing a union and affiliating with you.

The dissatisfaction is spreading amongst our members and the tin workers are talking about withdrawing from the Amalgamated Asso-

ciation unless there is a change soon for the better, and I believe there is a great field right amongst the Iron, Steel and Tin workers.

No doubt you will remember me; I met you in Cincinnati several times; I was the Labor Day speaker at the park here and am at present Deputy in this district, but instead of organizing for the Amalgamated Association, unless there is a change for the better in the near future, I may yield to the wishes of our people and work for some other head. I was requested by Newport, Ky., people a short time ago to start a new organization, but I declined at the time.

Now, I would like to hear from you as I am in doubt what to do, whether to take the field or not. Not that I doubt that the I. W. W. are better than the A. F. L., for which I have little use, and for Gompers none.

With best wishes I remain, yours,

HARRY GRIFFITHS.

(Committee on Organization.)

NO. 62.

Whereas, The office of a president is useless in a movement based upon revolutionary lines and considering further that a president is the symbol of power and authority, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the Local No. 353 of Spring Valley, stand for the abolition of said office,

Believing that an Executive Board is sufficient to direct the movement with the aid of the secretary or secretaries when such are in need.

Whereas, For the purpose of unifying and strengthening the new organization it is necessary that the work of organizing be started right after the convention, in the coal regions, especially in the following states: Illinois, Indiana, Pennsylvania and Ohio, by starting said agitation in the coal centers and continuing through other states in order to give encouragement to those who are already organized in mixed locals.

Whereas, We believe that no person or persons are in a position to understand the conditions better than the workers themselves, therefore be it

Resolved, That when it becomes necessary for any locals to cease work by declaring strike or otherwise, such declaration must be valid without the sanction of the Executive Board.

Local 353, I. W. W., of Spring Valley, Ill.

(Committees on Constitution and Organization.)

NO. 63.

London, Ontario, Sept. 15, 1906.

To the Delegates of the Industrial Workers of the World, in Convention assembled:

Greetings:

Owing to the expense and the short period which mixed Local No. 328 of London, Ontario, has been organized, we are unable to be represented by a delegate at this Convention and resort to this means of bringing certain matters before your notice which we consider in the interests and for the welfare of this organization.

Whereas, This organization desires to reach the whole working class and organize them, and this can be best accomplished by having our meetings open and allowing them freedom to enter, and

Whereas, We cannot guarantee that all who join this organization are, or will be, honorable men and that to an honorable man, sincere in

the movement, an obligation is unnecessary, and to a dishonorable man who intends to work its ill an obligation is not binding, and,

Whereas, The formality of leading candidates for initiation from one officer to another to receive instructions and charges which could all be given by the President, is a waste of time, therefore be it

Resolved, That Local No. 328 ask the Convention to consider this matter and abolish the "Ritual," placing instead thereof in the constitution a simple form of initiation defining the Class Struggle and the reasons why this organization was formed.

Whereas an organization is more of a unit when all the members receive the same education and same official organ, therefore be it

Resolved, That we ask this Convention to consider ways and means whereby every member will get the official organ without having to solicit his subscription.

(Signed), JOHN PEARCE, President.

PHILIP COURTENAY, Secretary.

(Committee on Constitution.)

NO. 64.

Tonopah, Nev., Sept. 13, 1906.

W. E. Trautmann.

Dear Sir:

At our regular meeting, Sept. 10, 1906, it was moved, seconded and carried

To ask the Convention to send out an organizer for this district, as we need one very badly.

Yours fraternally,

H. T. SHAW, President.

G. A. ROBERTS, Secretary.

Tonopah Local I. W. W. No. 325.

(Committee on Organization.)

NO. 65.

Ocean Park, Cal., Sept. 14, 1906.

Mr. W. E. Trautmann,  
Chicago, Ill.

Dear Sir and Comrade:

I am at present playing with a set of non-union men. I was taken sick at Las Vegas, N. M., and came to Los Angeles in July and was in the hospital there five weeks.

If you will send me a blank I can organize all these non-union musicians in a local by themselves, but they will not enter a mixed local. Please tend to this at once, and oblige,

Yours fraternally,

S. J. DUFFIELD.

(Committee on Organization.)

NO. 66.

Communication from George Abbott, Butte Workingmen's Union  
No. 5.

MISSING.

(Resolution Com.)

NO. 67.

Mixed Union No. 328, London, Ont.  
September 16, 1906.

Mr. W. E. Trautmann,  
General Secretary-Treasurer.

Dear Sir and Comrade:

Could you find out if any of the delegates from the east would pass this way on their return, and if it would be possible for us to arrange

for a meeting and have one of them address it, as an outside speaker carries more weight with him and we believe would help us in arousing a greater interest and increasing our membership?

If possible let us know at the earliest possible time, as we would require to advertise it thoroughly.

Fraternally yours,

PHILIP COURTENAY, Secretary.

(Committee on Organization.)

NO. 68.

Cleveland, O., Sept. 17, 1906.

Mr. W. E. Trautmann,  
Chicago, Ill.

Dear Sir:

Yours of the 15th received. I wish to inform you that I did not ask you to send us strike-breakers but merely union men of the I. W. W., because they were recommended to us by a man belonging to the I. W. W., not a baker, but of a different class of work.

Our men are not on a strike. We pay standard wages and our men work eight hours. We simply wanted more men, because when we want a certain man to work for us they gave us a different man, saying he is supposed to work. Now, I think we have a right to pick a man, and if one don't suit us, or does not do the work, we have the right to reject him and get another, but they would not give us another, so we asked you people for men on the advice of an I. W. W. man.

That is all there is to it, and we did not make a request for strike breakers.

Very truly yours,

THE FOREST CITY BAKING CO.

Per James Rosenberg.

Cleveland, O., Sept. 11, 1906.

Secretary of Industrial Union,  
Chicago, Ill.

Dear Sir:

Having been referred to you for information, I thereby will put the facts to you:

We are a corporation and employ union men of the International, but we cannot get along with them, though we pay the best wages and treat them better than any other employer. They are aware that we cannot do without them, as none of the employers can bake, and so do not understand it. When they don't have things their own way they stop work in the middle of things and we have to bribe them so that the dough does not spoil.

Now if one of the men demands a high salary and we do not want to pay it to him they all leave the work, and if we get other men from the union they beat the men up and won't let them do the work.

As the men working for us are the main men of their local we cannot report or do anything.

Therefore I would ask you to kindly refer me to the Bakers' Local and I would try to get men from the Industrial Union.

Kindly let me know as soon as possible the address of the local, and if there is anything you can say on the subject, please write at once.

Very truly yours,

THE FOREST CITY BAKING CO.

Per J. Rosenberg.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: I have written, "Note. Committee on Ways and Means," so that the whole matter will have to be thrashed out

any way, and the Committee on Ways and Means will have to figure out how to secure the support of the Capmakers in their fight.

(Committee on Ways and Means.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Now that the resolutions have all been read and assigned to the various committees, what is your pleasure?

DEL. McMULLEN: I would like to offer a motion at this time that the Secretary-Treasurer be authorized to have a list of the various committees printed, something like these tally sheets here, so that the entire membership and delegates to this convention will know who they are.

Seconded and unanimously carried.

DEL. DE LEON: I move that this convention now adjourn to meet tomorrow afternoon at one o'clock, so as to give the committees an opportunity to do their work. (Seconded.)

DEL. McMULLEN: Before you put that motion I would ask the mover of it, with his permission, to make one announcement.

DEL. DE LEON: I will amend the motion to read this way: "I move that when we adjourn."

DEL. McMULLEN: I am perfectly willing that we adjourn if you will just let me make this announcement.

DEL. DE LEON: All right.

DEL. McMULLEN: The Auditing Committee will meet in the general office at 7 o'clock this evening. I understand that the Mining Committee, the Miners here, have called a meeting for 2 p. m. I don't know how long they will be there, and I will have to attend that. Those on the Auditing Committee are as follows: McMullen, Hauck, Stone, Fox and Markley.

The resolutions were distributed among the various committees, and on motion the convention then adjourned until Thursday, Sept. 27, 1 p. m.

#### SESSION—SEPT. 27.

The convention met at 1 o'clock p. m. pursuant to adjournment, President Sherman presiding.

The roll of members was called by the Secretary.

DEL. ST. JOHN: According to the rules adopted the Committee on Constitution has the right of way to report today. The Committee on Constitution is ready to report.

The Committee on Constitution, through its Secretary, Delegate Kinneally, reported as follows:

#### REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTION.

DEL. KINNEALLY: Mr. Chairman and fellow-delegates, I will state before beginning that we have been unable to finish all the work, but we will report as far as we have gone. The first matter we took up was Article 1, and after discussing Article 1 of the Constitution as to organization we came to this conclusion and adopted the following Article to be the Article to be presented to this convention, for your action:

Article 1. Section 1. This organization shall be known as the Industrial Workers of the World, and shall be composed of thirteen Industrial Departments. The Industrial Departments shall consist of not less than ten local unions aggregating a membership of not less than 10,000 members.

The Industrial Departments shall be subdivided into industrial unions of closely kindred industries in the appropriate organizations for representation in the departmental administration.



The subdivision "National Industrial Union," cutting out "International Union," and inserting "Industrial Union."

The subdivision Industrial and National Industrial unions shall have complete industrial autonomy in their respective internal affairs, provided the General Executive Board shall have power to control these industrial unions in matters concerning the interests of the general welfare.

These departments shall be designated as follows:

Department of Mining Industry.

Department of Transportation Industry.

Department of Metal and Machinery Industry.

Department of Glass and Pottery Industry.

Department of Food Stuffs Industry.

Department of Brewery, Wine and Distillery Industry.

Department of Floriculture, Stock and General Farming Industries.

Department of Building Industry.

Department of Textile Industries.

Department of Leather Industries.

Department of Woodworking Industries.

Department of Public Service Industries.

Department of Miscellaneous Manufacturing.

DEL. KINNEALLY: This we present for your consideration as Article 1 of the Constitution.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is it the pleasure of the convention that they will read their report and then take up the different articles seriatim?

DEL. FITZGERALD: I move to take it up seriatim.

A DELEGATE: Read the whole.

DEL. DE LEON: To read the report and afterwards take it up seriatim is just to consume time. We should remember that we are not here as the Congress of the United States, which has the whole matter presented to it in writing. It is useless to hear a report and have it go through our ears. We must see it through our eyes. Otherwise before we come to a third or fourth amendment we will have forgotten the first, which may not be in harmony. I therefore suggest, unless it be necessary to make a motion, that we take up these clauses seriatim as they are presented and not waste time by reading the whole of it and then go again over that seriatim. If there is no objection I move that that be concurred in. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It is moved and seconded that we concur in the report of the first section of the constitution as reported by the committee. Are you ready for the question?

DEL. MOTHERWELL: Mr. Chairman—

DEL. DE LEON: Hold on, I have the floor.

DEL. MOTHERWELL: I beg your pardon, I have the floor.

THE CHAIRMAN: You made the motion.

DEL. DE LEON: And consequently I wish to speak to it.

THE CHAIRMAN: You made the motion, do you wish the floor?

DEL. DE LEON: I wish to speak to that motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have a right to, having made the motion.

DEL. DE LEON: Under the rules I wish to say that the Secretary of the committee read more than was necessary. I think that all he has to read is what is amended, not what is not amended. The proposition of the Committee on Constitution, the essential change it makes, is that it inserts there a provision that the departments shall consist of not less than 10,000. That is all the amendment there is under Section 2. The rest of the article that he read remains as it was, so that it reads "And shall be composed of 13 industrial departments,"

and that the departments—I forget what the language is—"shall consist of not less than a membership of 10,000 in the aggregate." That is the essential change.

The reason that the Committee adopted that recommendation is that we consider that with a smaller number the departments rather work against than in favor of an increase in the membership; that a smaller number in the departments, as we have seen, when the industries are limited, and one thing and another, interfere with the department. If the unit is the industrial union it is out of the way to have a department consisting of a smaller number than 10,000. Even we ourselves thought that in order to do business we must open up shop, and that if the membership be fixed at 10,000 it took so much longer to build up and establish the industry, so that the shop is open not by the department, but by the divisions of the department, and the divisions are the industrial unions, and just as soon as an industrial union is on its feet that shop is open and can proceed to work.

There are a few minor amendments proposed, but they are purely in the nature of what may be called typographical. You will notice in the constitution in one place industrial union is spelled with capital letters and in other places it is spelled with no caps. The amendment proposes to keep up uniformly capitals. Then another typographical change is that the word "International" is left out throughout, not only through this paragraph, but throughout the constitution, because the term "Industrial Workers of the World" is all the international that we need. The other is nothing but a repetition, so that instead of saying "International Industrial Department" we have "Industrial Department," and instead of saying "National Industrial Unions" we have "Industrial Unions"—purely typographical. The main change is the 10,000 basis.

DEL. McMULLEN: I rise at this time to ask a question. I do not notice any proposed change in the Preamble. I would like to know if this proposition is to amend the constitution, why the matter of amending the Preamble was not taken up. Or is it that the wish of the committee is that there is to be no amendment to the Preamble? I am asking for information of the line on which they have proceeded.

DEL. DE LEON: The committee has yet proposed no change in the Preamble, and it is now stating the changes which it does propose. It will afterwards take up the various propositions before it and it will report upon them.

DEL. McMULLEN: Well, Mr. President, as it is a question of amendment, I at this time offer the following amendment to the Preamble of our present constitution, which I desire incorporated in these proceedings—

DEL. FOX: I rise to a point of order. The Preamble is not under discussion. The brother can bring that up later if he wishes, but not under the present question.

DEL. McMULLEN: I want to say, Mr. President, that the very first thing in the forming of this constitution is the Preamble.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair will have to rule the brother at this time out of order as to the Preamble. I will rule, however, that the resolution will be admissible, but not at this time.

DEL. McMULLEN: The resolution is not at this time?

THE CHAIRMAN: Not while we are discussing the report of the committee.

DEL. McMULLEN: Very well. On the report of the committee I rose to ask a question to find out the status of this thing. Now I want to take up the matter of amending that section. It is exceedingly diffi-

cult for a person to discuss the proposition as it appears there in this form coming from the committee. The supposition of a great number of us was that those proposed changes in the constitution, wherever they might occur in the wisdom of the committee, would at least be in typewritten form and that they could be read and that we could understand what the proposed change is. Now, I glean from the reading there—and that is all the knowledge I have—that the real change is in amending or striking out that word “International” wherever it appears in there, and also the qualification of the number that would constitute a department, which I distinctly heard read there was 10,000. Isn’t that correct, Mr. Secretary of the committee?

DEL. KINNEALLY: Yes.

DEL. McMULLEN: Now, I want to ask at this time, does this affect the organizations and departments that are now in existence? Is it the sense of the committee that this will in a sense be retroactive and affect those that are already organized? Or that if an organization should acquire 10,000 members and afterwards the membership status fall below that 10,000, would they relapse into the condition of industrial organizations as prior to the time of being organized in a department? I do not see any notation to that effect, that if they did not maintain that status of 10,000 or more, and I am trying to find out what the intent and purpose of the committee is on that. It is not necessary to rehash anything that has been stated here, but from our old status of 3,000 members it was practically argued on this floor that because all the departments had fallen below they were disorganized. It was with a view to bringing that out. Now, generally speaking, if I can reach an understanding of what the committee contemplates with their proposed amendment here, I cannot see any objection to it. If it is to be 10,000 for the purpose of organization, and then after once organized in a department, no matter how they might fluctuate, they would still stand as a department—you understand I mean fluctuation in membership—that they would still stand as a department, having all the rights of departments as to representation, affiliation and legislation. I want the committee to be somewhat explicit on this, as it is one of the very peculiar points that have raised crises in the formation of this body. We, particularly over at this side, desire to obtain information whether in some future convention the organizations distinctly affiliated with a department could come in here and claim representation as was done in the formation of this convention under this present constitution, peculiarly worded just the same as you are presenting your proposed changes.

DEL. RYAN: A point of information. I would like to ask the delegate whether he is talking to a resolution, a motion, or what?

THE CHAIRMAN: He was asking, I should judge from the drift of his conversation—asking these questions, and wants them brought out in the arguments here so that he will be clear on the real meaning of what has been reported by your committee.

DEL. RYAN: He stated on taking the floor that the I. W. W. took certain action, and it is not fair to the convention, under parliamentary usage, to allow a man to take ten or fifteen minutes and then make a motion here.

DEL. ST. JOHN: In answer to Del. McMullen—

THE CHAIRMAN: Just a minute, brother St. John. Have you finished what you had to say, Brother McMullen?

DEL. McMULLEN: I understood that I was interrupted there for a point of information, which in no sense affects my time on this floor,

if the Chair is going to protect members on the floor in the exercise of their time.

THE CHAIRMAN: I have not been calling time on anybody, but I have a time card to run by now.

DEL. McMULLEN: I cannot of course prevent members from rising. Del. St. John started to say something; I do not quite understand his purpose.

DEL. ST. JOHN: I thought you were wanting to have your question answered, that is all.

DEL. McMULLEN: I certainly want an answer on the question, so that I can vote intelligently on the proposed amendment. I want an application of your language. I want to know what you want to do, and that explanation is not satisfactory. I of course am exercising my right to vote as my judgment dictates, and every one else can do the same. Now, if there is no proposed change in the form of this article further than changing the words 3,000 to 10,000 and the striking out of the word "International," to me it makes no difference; I could consent to the change. But I would like to understand the application of that from those who are proposing it. They saw the errors under which we have labored in our formation under this language, and I do not see that they are offering us any relief from the situation.

DEL. LINGENFELTER: As a question of information, have you a copy of the rules as presented by the Rules Committee?

THE CHAIRMAN: I have not.

DEL. LINGENFELTER: Then I would suggest that the Chairman get them and hold us down closely to the rule in the time for speaking.

THE CHAIRMAN: Will the secretary furnish a copy?

DEL. ST. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, in reply to Brother McMullen, I will state that the amendment means just exactly what it says; that in order to be qualified to be a department, an industrial department of the Industrial Workers of the World, such a department will have to have 10,000 members and that any industry which does not come up to that standard will not be a department.

DEL. KIRKPATRICK: Mr. Chairman—

DEL. KLEESE: What is before the house? A motion to concur? The point I want to raise is that—

THE CHAIRMAN: Del. Kirkpatrick has the floor.

DEL. KLEESE: I rise to a point of order.

THE CHAIRMAN: State your point.

DEL. KLEESE: My point is this: that if we will make a motion to have this adopted or rejected, then our rules of order will come in and nobody can chew the rag longer than five minutes.

THE CHAIRMAN: There has been a motion to that effect.

DEL. KLEESE: To adopt this report?

A DELEGATE: Yes.

DEL. KIRKPATRICK: Brother Chairman, it is not clear to me as to what position the departments already recognized by the Industrial Workers of the World will be placed in. As I understand the constitution and the amendment to it, it will require 10,000 to form an industrial department. Does that mean from now on, or does that mean to disband any industrial department that is not up to that standard at the present time? I would like to ask the committee if that is their interpretation, that any department that is not up to the 10,000 mark now should be disbanded? I would like to have an answer yes or no on that.

DEL. KINNEALLY: I think Comrade St. John as chairman of the committee has answered that question, and I would answer it again, "Yes."

DEL. McCABE: It means disbanding.

DEL. FITZGERALD: As a department, if they are not up to the standard of 10,000 and 10 locals, of course.

DEL. KIRKPATRICK: I don't want the time of Fitzgerald or any other delegate. I am not going to throw any slurs at any delegate on this floor, and I won't have any delegate throw any slurs at me. I am opposed to disbanding the Metal and Machinery Department. I want to say that I do not believe that this convention has any authority to do it. I believe that the membership of the Department of Metal and Machinery should be the judges of that, and I am opposed to that amendment for that reason. I recognize 10,000 to be a snug little department in any industry, but I also recognize the Department of Metal and Machinery with the local unions directly attached to that department now as organized under those conditions, and I believe that they should be given an opportunity by a referendum vote from that department to vote on whether they will disband at this time or not.

DEL. McKINNON: A point of order. I think as a member of that committee that I should take precedence over any others.

THE CHAIRMAN: If the brother will give way.

DEL. McKINNON: As a member of that committee, when that matter came up I asked that question, if that was to affect the present departments, and as the question was not satisfactorily answered I maintained that it should not. Nevertheless, as I was in the minority, it was carried. As a member of that committee I maintain and I stand for the maintaining of the two present departments being recognized until they are disbanded by referendum vote as Brother Kirkpatrick states.

DEL. MOTHERWELL: Mr. Chairman, and fellow delegates, as the matter has come in here just now it shows what has happened in our committee, because we will refer that to you direct. There won't be any minority or majority reports submitted here, which should not be in this case. I want to say to you, each and every one of you, as I understand the I. W. W. it is a general organization of labor. While I may think one way and you may think another way, or some other man may think another, we want the universal consent of every member of the rank and file of this organization to have his say in this, and it should be submitted to a referendum vote irrespective of departments. The rank and file should say whether there shall be a department with less than 10,000 or whether it shall come up in conformity with that constitution that will govern us, and we won't override the constitution as we have done in this last convention. We don't want the next convention to come here and say that they will override the constitution that we submit here today and say there is no constitution because it don't apply to their matters and their ideas that they have got here. I want to say to each and every one of you that I feel that I want this organization to live, and if you act as you have been acting here it can't live; you won't be governed by anything. You want to be governed by your individual minds, and you can't have an organization that way. I will state that if the committees will come here and report their actions to the convention, and then when they have submitted their final report, after you have had time to consider that matter you can act intelligently. But if you go on and do what is being tried here right now, to submit this thing and not let me think over it or any other members, you establish what is known and you

have heard on this floor as gag law. A man votes for something, and after he considers it he says, "I didn't have a chance to think," and he goes back home to the people that he represents and says, "Such was done, and I wouldn't have done it if I had had a chance to think." Now, let these committees, every one of them, come in here and make their final report, and if they ain't prepared to report in full they can report progress and then come in here and make a complete report, and we won't take up your time and keep you and me and everybody else here.

DEL. TULLAR: My idea was partially expressed by the brother here. This convention cannot, in my opinion, adopt a constitution without submitting it to a referendum vote. If we are to live up to the spirit of the Preamble, the rank and file must have a say whether it shall or shall not be the constitution of this organization. All we can do as a convention is to come to an understanding among ourselves as to the constitution. But when we do so, in my opinion that constitution is not effective until it has been submitted to the rank and file for a referendum vote, something that our present constitution never was.

DEL. LINGENFELTER: Mr. Chairman, we are not discussing as to whether this constitution goes to a referendum or not. We are discussing, I believe, Article I of the old constitution and its amendment. Is that correct? Or do I understand it correctly, Mr. Chairman?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

DEL. McMULLEN: Ain't we discussing one section of Article I?

DEL. LINGENFELTER: I ask the Chairman and not you.

DEL. McMULLEN: That is what I ask you.

DEL. LINGENFELTER: I asked the Chairman and not you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Boys, stop your sparring business. We have got lots to do.

DEL. LINGENFELTER: I don't want to spar. That is the reason I want to cut it out. As I understand, the Constitution Committee attempts to make Article I more specific. At the last convention it was not specific. There are other matters in which I agree with the Constitution Committee and shall vote for them. An organization of an industrial department with 3,000 members scattered over the length and breadth of this great industrial nation does not fulfill the expectation in any manner, shape or form, and would hardly fulfill that expectation even if that whole department was centralized in one great industrial center. For that reason I favor the 10,000 clause. As an illustration, in Schenectady, with the electrical workers, I believe my fellow delegate will agree with me that if the whole 3,000 members were centered in that one industry it would just begin to fit the condition in that one factory. So, manifestly, 10,000 is certainly a very limited amount. But there is one thing I want to be clear upon, and I would like to have it cleared up by our Constitution Committee. That is: Take as an illustration the tobacco industry. I would like to have the constitution specifically state as to what comprises an industry or a subdivision of an industry. The tobacco industry, to my mind, is distinctly an industry to itself. It is not mentioned in the constitution directly, and if that should become voluntarily or otherwise an organization of this body, I want to be enabled to specifically state as to what department and in what manner the tobacco workers, including the entire tobacco industry, organized and reflected through the present developed instrument known as the trust, will be formed in this new organization.

DEL. DUNCAN: Mr. Chairman, as I understand the report of the committee, I would not be prepared to endorse it without getting some further light on it. I understand they leave the words "complete industrial autonomy" in the clause just as it is there stated in our present constitution. Now, I want to get some of their reasons, if possible, for raising the number of members required for a department from 3,000 to 10,000. There are certainly some reasonable grounds for objecting to the raising of the required membership for a department. The proletariat will as a rule organize much more readily if they do it under a department charter with an understanding that their particular shop interests are to be furthered as soon as possible. Now, then, if we raise the requirement for a department that means remaining longer in the local unions; and this case that Brother Lingenfelter mentioned of a particular locality controlling the situation and shaping the policy of the department according to their local conditions, I think could be remedied better by curtailing or restricting the autonomy that the department is allowed to exercise. I am opposed to complete industrial autonomy on the part of any department. I am opposed to complete autonomous action on the part of any subdivision of the Industrial Workers of the World, and I come here with written instructions from my constituents to oppose departmental autonomy. I want some reasons from the members of the committee for their raising the required membership. On the score of the departmental autonomy proposition being unchanged I am obliged to oppose their report.

DEL. McCABE: I wish to go on record as opposing the dissolving of departments without a referendum vote. I have received instructions, and so has Del. Kohl, to protest against dissolving the Transportation Department, and I say it would be unfair and an injustice to the members of that department who have joined the movement in the last year. We have not got 150 members in that department that were members a year ago this September or October, I think. There has been considerable propaganda work done all over the United States, and even as far as Mexico, in the interest of the Transportation Department, and I feel at this time that you are doing an injustice to both the Transportation Department and the Metal and Machinery Department to make any attempt to override the members of those two departments without giving them a chance to vote on the same; and I enter my protest as I have been directed to do by the membership of that department.

DEL. SIMS: Mr. President and fellow delegates, at the present time it is rather premature to demand the referendum proposition. Now, we do not know what will come up in the recommendations from the Constitution Committee as to changes in this constitution. Hence to make a demand for a referendum upon these propositions is rather premature, because we do not know but what they have adopted or will recommend such a mode of procedure. Now, there are two points that were brought up that struck me very forcibly. That was concerning the required number of ten thousand in a department, which was cleared up by one of the members of the Constitution Committee when he stated emphatically that the wording which was read out by the Secretary of the Constitution Committee meant just what it said. If it means just what it says it can not be considered to mean something else. Now, as to the present existing department it has been proven and demonstrated to this convention, without any scruples of doubt, that even constitutionally speaking, in conformity with our present constitution, that they are not legally departments. Hence I can not

see, even while taking as a basis of argument the present constitution—

DEL. McCABE: I rise to a point of order. By the constitution that this convention a year ago adopted those are departments, and I object to any delegate getting on the floor and telling us that they are not departments.

THE CHAIRMAN: He has a right to his opinion.

DEL. SIMS: The constitution a year ago was adopted. Hence the adoption of the constitution embodied a law which states three thousand. Now, that was the law adopted in that constitution. I mean that was the law embodied in that constitution. Hence on the basis of the legality of it, from a legal standpoint from this constitution, it proves very plainly that these supposed departments are not departments. Hence, if we are going to abide by the constitution we must recognize the legality of it. The contention that they are departments must then of necessity be based upon false premises, without any scruple of doubt. Now, you have got your Constitution Committee here, and they have recommended this change, and I can not see upon what point, from a logical standpoint or a legal standpoint, that a contention could be raised as to the maintaining of the supposed present departments which were illegally formed.

DEL. MOORE: As I understand it from the delegates, we are here today to lay the basis of industrial unionism. Now, before we can lay the basis for departments I think it very reasonable we should lay the industry. Now, the first thing here says "a department of mining industry." I can conceive of a mining industry with the different departments in that industry, like the metallic department, like the oil department, like the coal department and like the salt department.

DEL. ST. JOHN: I rise to a point of order. My point of order is we are not discussing the points of demarkation between the industries. We are discussing the number of members necessary in order to form a department.

THE CHAIRMAN: The chair is of the opinion that the brother who raised the point of order did not cover it all. There are other questions here outside of the number that comprises a department, as recommended by your committee. There are several changes in the constitution that they offer, and if I understand it right the whole question is under discussion pertaining to that department. And it occurs to me, therefore, that the brother is in order on the line that he is offering here.

DEL. MOORE: Furthermore, I can conceive of a transportation industry. I can also conceive of electrical subdivisions. I can conceive of electric railways as being a department. I can conceive of steam railways as being a department. But now, coming down to the third department of the metal and machinery industry, I can not conceive of any such thing as a metal and machinery industry. I can conceive of a manufacturing industry with the metal and machinery department. This is all I have got to say.

DEL. PINKERTON: The question at issue that I see before us at the present time, in this contention of the departments, is one that I think should be settled. Being a member of the rank and file, and not being in touch with the general organization, that is, when I was a member of the United Brotherhood of Railway Employees, I understood at the conference that these organizations were to be installed as a department into the Industrial Workers of the World. After these departments became installed into this organization it was found that some of them were not self-sustaining. Nevertheless, the constitution



was constructed after the installation had taken place, and that constitution stated specifically that each department must have a membership of three thousand. The United Brotherhood of Railway Employees, as has been demonstrated to you in convention assembled, did not have that membership at the time that it was installed. But, nevertheless, the rights of a department had not been taken from it. The question then that I understand before this convention at the present time, and the one that should be answered, is this: When a department falls below its department representation as outlined in this constitution it ceases to exist as a department.

DEL. MAHONEY: Mr. Chairman, and Fellow Delegates: I am of the opinion that while we are discussing Article I of Section 1 of the report of the Constitution Committee, we are amending Section 1 and Section 2 of Article 1 of your constitution, also amending Section 7 of Article 7 of your constitution. I take it that this being true that as one delegate on this floor I would not be in a position to intelligently vote on the amalgamation of the two first sections of your constitution, and also to amend Section 4, Article 7, without hearing the recommendations of the committee through on those different sections. I am of the opinion that the committee should read their amendments; then that this convention should act on them seriatim, thus giving each delegate a conception of what the amendment might amount to clear through on the constitution as constructed. Or, in other words, to know where there was an entirely new section offered as an amendment or a substitute to the old one. I would take it then that I would be in a position to know whether or not the constitution was coming together as it should. And I feel at this time that that should be done.

At this point Del. Mahoney took the chair and President Sherman addressed the convention, as follows:

PRESIDENT SHERMAN: In the organizing of departments I understand it can be done only after ten thousand members have been organized in an industry. The brother here made a remark that the tobacco industry was an industry of its own. My conception of this organization is it is not an industry organization but an industrial organization, and if it is an industrial organization we can not segregate the cigarmaker from the man that works in the tobacco factory and call them an industrial organization. If we recognize them as different sections then it is an industry organization and not an industrial organization. If we segregate the coal miner from the salt miner and the mineral miner, then we have got three industries. But if we put them into a department it is an industrial organization, and you must change the name of your organization if you are going to segregate these and call them industrial because they are industries and not industrial. I feel that this convention will make a mistake if they tear down any department that they have got, no matter how small they are. My recommendation was on the ground to have ten thousand members, for this reason: It is quite expensive through inexperience in getting the machinery to work in an international, or in a department, or in anything where they segregate themselves into an organization or into a government of their own. It is expensive, more expensive the first year than it is the second year, after the machinery gets to working and things get to working smooth. That was one of the main reasons that I had for raising the membership before we would organize them into an industrial organization. Now, the organizations that are now connected with your organization, while their machinery may be small and perhaps weak in places, yet there is a machine there; and if the machine isn't handled by the right kind of engineers, and

firemen, and workmen, change them, and put in new help, the same as any other government does when they are dissatisfied with the administration. Let the rank and file of that department, who have elected them and who have maintained that department, have a voice. Now, the question has been raised here, is this to be submitted to a referendum vote; as to that I feel that before we proceed one inch further that should be decided, so that the rank and file, so that the delegates here will know this is to be sent out to those that we represent, or are we to be the God and master of this thing, and what we say they have got to take down their throats whether they like it or not. I think that before we proceed with this constitution every delegate should know whether this is to be the last nail that is going to be driven into the constitution, or whether the action of this convention is going to be submitted to the rank and file. If it is to be submitted to the rank and file it is absolutely safe, because I have got confidence in the rank and file of the Industrial Workers of the World in all of the departments. But if it is going to be settled here for sixty thousand members by less than one hundred delegates then I am absolutely opposed to the proposition.

DEL. LINGENFELTER: Mr. Chairman, are we discussing as to whether we are going to put it to a referendum or not?

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The delegate that has got the floor is discussing how it is going to be amended and if it is in order.

PRESIDENT SHERMAN: I also agree with Brother Mahoney that the whole recommendations, perhaps, should be read by the committee so that we will know what is to follow, so that we will know the different changes that are to follow. Then we will know what we are voting, that is going to be fitted to it in the next paragraph. You take this and endorse it or turn it down. If you endorse it you don't know what the next thing is that will be sprung on you. The most important piece of work that you will do in this convention will be as to the constitution of your organization. That should be read, all of the action of your committee. Then start over seriatim, and take up, piece by piece, after you have decided it and polled these delegates by a vote, putting everybody on record, as to whether they believe that the people should be the voice and not the delegates. Then you are prepared to go ahead and proceed with the work that is laid out for you, and which you should do.

At this point President Sherman resumed the chair.

DEL. SCHWEINBERG: Mr. Chairman and Fellow Delegates: I did not intend to speak on the first article of the constitution, but I am interested in the formation of departments. It is necessary for me to bring it before the delegates. The Committee on Constitution says that the department should be composed of ten thousand members and not less. As Brother St. John says here, it means distinctly that the departments in existence today without 10,000 members must be dissolved. They can only be reorganized if you have the necessary number of members. My local union of Chicago instructed me at the last meeting specifically that I should stand for the department, but that it should be reorganized by this convention. There is a resolution in the hands of the constitutional committee to this effect. It is distinctly stated that this convention should go on record as recognizing the Metal Machinery Department as in existence today, up to the required three thousand members in a department, but there should be orders given to the officers of the department which should be carried out to the general members of the Metal Machinery Department. For this reason it is impossible for me to concur in the recommendation of the

Committee on Constitution. I have to stand by the order of my local union.

DEL. PARKS: Mr. Chairman, the form of the organization that we are going to have is going to be laid down in the constitution, but the purpose and objects of the constitution are defined by the manifesto and by the preamble. We must keep this guiding star in view. And if we find that the constitution which we constructed last year, or which we may construct now, obstructs or diverts or hinders in the accomplishment of the principles, aims, and objects of this revolutionary organization, I say that we, the assembled delegates of this revolutionary movement in America, have the power and the right to abolish that constitution and make such a constitution as will expedite us in accomplishing the aims and objects of this organization. I say that we have no right to make any constitution here that will abridge the rights of delegates who may be sent here from our constituency in the future. I believe that it was not the aim of the delegates here assembled last year to draft any constitution that would in any way divert the labor movement from the aims and goal which is marked out in that manifesto. What is the aim and goal marked out in that manifesto? It was to create departments and bring into the labor movement the reign of departmentalism, to bring in the reign of a lot of officials who would fight for their jobs, as they are standing on the floor of the convention today fighting for an old department that we find is helping to defeat the aims and objects of this industrial union movement of this country.

DEL. KIRKPATRICK: I rise to a point of order. My point of order is I do not stand on this floor fighting for my position. I stand for the organization I represent, that sent me here. And I think it is unfair for any delegate to try to hold up any individual and say they are looking for their job.

DEL. PARKS: If the shoe fits you, wear it.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The Chair will rule the point is well taken.

DEL. PARKS: We stand upon an altogether different ground from Delegate McMullen, when he took this floor a few days ago and said that the revolution was something that was new to him, something that he would not associate with and a movement of which he was no part. I believe that this convention was properly launched in the opening speech of William B. Haywood in this convention last year, when he said it was a revolutionary movement.

DEL. McMULLEN: I want to know, when you hold me down to a discussion of the proposed section under consideration, whether McMullen's name is in there, and if it isn't I don't want it discussed. If my name appears in that amendment the brother has a perfect right to criticise McMullen.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The Chair will rule the point as well taken.

DEL. PARKS: I believe that I have the right to show up the motives and the stand in the labor movement of any individual who goes upon this floor and takes a stand, pro and con, upon any question regarding this constitution.

DEL. McMULLEN: I understood that the brother should tell us something about this amendment and nothing about this movement. He should tell us something about this amendment, why we should or should not vote for or against it. I insist on that point of order, Mr. President.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Try and confine yourself to the motion, Delegate Parks.

DEL. PARKS: My brothers, the Chairman has allowed the President of this organization to get up here and discuss the merits of the referendum, discuss constitutionalism. And I think as the question of constitutionalism has been discussed by every man on this floor that it is my province to discuss the question of constitutionalism also. I will agree with the Chair as he rules on this point that it is altogether improper at this time. I believe that the issue has been brought up here improperly, and not in the most expeditious way. I believe that we ought to take up one point and discuss one point at a time. And I believe a good place would have been to begin with the preamble, to see whether we are going to hold to the guiding star, or whether we are going to leave that star and follow some other star. I believe that is correct. The aims and goal of this society is to organize the labor movement so that they will be able to fight the capitalist class as it is organized today. In a country of different capitalistic institutions under the competitive era, they find that it will be more advantageous for them to get together and amalgamate themselves into one great organization. What did they do? Did they leave one little industrial plant at one place to hold supreme autonomy regarding its activities? No. Often in these trusts they have absolutely destroyed the mill and the plant in one locality and wiped it out in order to effect a greater amalgamation. We are here to effect a great amalgamation of all the working classes of the world, to unite the wage workers of the world into one great organization, and not to divide them up into different departments and have them under the control of a lot of officials who will come up here in every convention and fight in order to maintain departmentalism as against industrial unionism. I am sorry that this is such a broad question here and it is such a general discussion. I would like to discuss the question of referendum but I haven't yet touched upon that, and I am going to reserve the right to take the floor at some future time to discuss that phase. I think the questions are altogether too broad that we are trying to tackle here. That is the reason I haven't got more to say at this time.

DEL. JOHNSON: It seems to me we are getting a little ahead of time in regard to the discussion of the constitution. It appears to me that as far as we have gone in accordance with the report that has been made by the Constitution Committee we have only proceeded to that one point at which the question arises as to whether ten thousand members shall form the basis of the department of the Industrial Workers of the World. And that is really the only question, or should be the only question, in the minds of the delegates at this time. Now, then, inasmuch as the question has been asked from the Committee on Constitution, as to whether that abolishes the department of transportation or the department of the metal industry, that doesn't make any difference. It is not a question for the Constitution Committee to decide as to whether those departments are to be abolished or not. That is a question that is up for this convention to decide. But we have not as yet reached that point at which we are to decide as to whether they are to be abolished or not. But the only question is as to whether ten thousand members shall form the basis of that department. Now, then, as far as the referendum is concerned, we have not as yet decided as to whether this constitution is to go out with a referendum or not. I presume that it is the consensus of opinion of this convention that whatever we decide here will go out for the referendum vote. But it is up for this convention to prepare something that can

be submitted to the membership at large for them to vote upon, and it seems to me that that is something that can be decided after we have decided upon this. But it seems to me that before we decide upon any particular part of this constitution the Constitution Committee should render their report, such as it might be, at this time. If they have not a completed report, we will take that report as it is. We accept their report as progressive. We then have the material, such as it is, presented to us by the Committee on Constitution, and we weigh these questions carefully, and when we come together after the Constitution Committee has rendered their full report we can take these things up seriatim, and decide as to what we want. And that is the manner in which, it seems to me, this convention should proceed in this matter. And therefore, if it is not out of order, Mr. Chairman, I will offer as a motion at this time that we hear the report, such as it is, of the Constitution Committee, and accept that report. Of course that is a little ahead of time; but what I want to move is that we hear the report of the Constitution Committee; that is, all they have to report up to this time.

DEL. ROBINSON: I second the motion.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: There is a motion at this time before the house to adopt the proposed amendment of the first section of your constitution. I would not take it, Delegate Johnson, that that would be an amendment to the motion to adopt.

DEL. JOHNSON: I don't really understand you, but the sense of my motion is that we hear the remainder of the report; that is, such as the committee has to offer at this time.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: I take it that you want to make that as an amendment to the motion before the house.

DEL. JOHNSON: There is a motion before the house.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: And that motion before the house is that the report of the committee on this section be adopted, if I understand correctly.

DEL. JOHNSON: Then I will offer that as an amendment to the motion.

DEL. ROBINSON: I second the amendment.

DEL. COX: I believe it will be unanimously agreed to hear the part of the report the Constitution Committee has. I believe we all want to hear it.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: I believe, properly, the motion made to continue the reading prior to action will supersede the motion to act on the first section. The Chair will entertain the motion of Delegate Johnson to continue the reading of the report of the Committee, and that will be properly before the house. But this in no way will do away with the motion on adopting the first section after the rest of the report is ready. I take it that the motion is in order.

DEL. DE LEON: I am opposed to that motion for this reason: We will simply consume time uselessly. It will be a waste of time. Even if the Committee on Constitution had done all its work, and were ready to report in full, it would be a waste of time, for the reason which I stated before when this matter was proposed. We cannot know a thing through our ears only. A thing of that nature we have to know through our eyes as well. So that no useful purpose would be served by consuming the time of this convention in hearing all of these clauses read. Before we have reached the fifth we shall have forgotten the first. Each clause as it is read will suggest to those who hear it certain things, pro or con. They will surely not pay any attention to the next, and if it should happen differently in this convention then it will

happen differently from what it happens everywhere where there are conventions of this nature, where we haven't got time enough to have these clauses engrossed in print so that we see the full scheme, so to speak.

But this report is not yet in full. If there be anything in the claim that you must know all this subject by clauses before we can understand any of it, the same objection would be raised after you had read this. We can not proceed to work until the committee will have done all its work. Now, I don't see that there is anything in this motion except an opinion which proceeds from an error, namely: that by adopting any one clause we are tied hand and foot. That is not so. We may adopt or reject all of these clauses, or, rather, we could not reject them all, but we may accept them all. Then a motion to accept the constitution as a whole will have to be put and will have to be carried before the thing becomes binding. They are not yet ready to report the whole. We will have to wait until we are ready to report the whole of it. The result of it will be more waste of time. The convention is becoming nervous, irritable, and uneasy. Men are here, myself among them, at the expense of our constituency. Others are officers in that same position. And I, for one, do not wish to be held responsible, or held as having prolonged this convention unnecessarily. Neither the former speakers, nor the brother who spoke last, has touched the real point. Will they explain how time can be saved? How information can be obtained by your method better than ours? And now keep in mind that after each clause is accepted, if it is accepted, the constitution will then have to be adopted as a whole, and not before then is it binding.

For those reasons I oppose this motion. It is a waste of time. I can see nothing in it. I do not mean to say that those people who make it have that purpose, but I do mean to say that it is welcome to those who desire to prolong this convention.

DEL. McDONALD: Mr. Chairman, in my estimation there are two questions that I would like to have answered before I vote on changing any of the constitution. I do not want to vote on changing this constitution without knowing something about what I am doing. Now, in the first place, I contend, and it is my opinion, that this convention should decide whether the constitution is to be submitted to the referendum after they vote on the amendment here on the floor. Now, I will vote against any clause being amended until that is decided by this convention. In the next place, I maintain that the first matter the Constitution Committee should take up is the Preamble. Now, what is the use in us making a constitution if it don't conform with the Preamble?

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Delegate McDonald, the motion before the house at this time is to have the committee proceed to read what report they have at this time, before starting to act on it. That is the motion that is under discussion, whether the committee continue to read their report, or whether it be acted on as they read it, section by section, at this time. After this motion is voted on then I will take it that your discussion might be in order.

DEL. FRUEH: Mr. Chairman, I can not vote either on the amendment or on the motion with the information that I have at the present time. The amendment is that the committee continue to read, but it doesn't state how far. Now, if the amendment means that the committee should continue reading that article only referring to the questions before the house, then I know what I am voting on. But it has not

been stated. In reference to the motion, if the amendment is put to a vote there can be no more discussion upon the motion, is that right?

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair does not recognize the motion as an amendment, but as a direct motion, that is, it supersedes the original motion to adopt.

DEL. FRUEH: Then according to that the amendment is lost. The motion is still before the house.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

DEL. FRUEH: Very well. Now, I would like to ask whether this motion as amended means that the article shall be read referring to this particular clause, that is, on organization. The Committee has gone away back to General Officers, etc. But I hold that what is before the house at the present time is the form of organization, subdivision, etc. Now, if the amendment means that the committee shall continue to read to the next paragraph, or the next article, then I can vote in favor of the amendment, and otherwise I can not, and I am asking for that information.

THE CHAIRMAN: I would answer the delegate by saying it is the understanding of the Chair that the mover of the motion meant by his motion that the committee should continue to submit what report they have at this time in its entirety. Am I correct?

DEL. JOHNSON: Correct.

DEL. KEOGH: We hear so much about delaying this convention, but I have seen more delays since we convened this afternoon than are really necessary. There isn't so much in the constitution altogether. It would not take half an hour to have the whole thing read over again, and what changes are going to be made, until we understand it. Then we can vote on those questions seriatim after we have understood the whole thing, and understand what changes are to be made in the other sections, and I for one will vote for the motion that it be all read as far as the Constitution Committee has gone, before we proceed any further.

DEL. McCUE: Believing as I do that the vote of this convention is not properly distributed, and as I have within me a fear of some action that may occur during the future deliberations of this body, I, as the delegate of St. Paul Mixed Local Union Number 307, believe that this body should decide here now as to whether or not its deliberations are to be submitted to the referendum of this organization. I believe that that is the proper method of procedure for us now. And then I also believe that each recommendation of the Committee on Constitution should be taken up at the rate of one at a time, and settled in the regular order at the rate of one at a time.

DEL. STONE: Now, I believe that all the delegates who are present here today have had experience in the different lines of work that we have been doing, and we as members of the Industrial Workers of the World have studied this preamble and the constitution as best we could, and we think that the constitution which was drawn up by the first convention of the Industrial Workers of the World is merely a skeleton of the line of work. Now, then, when we come to this convention, as the brother has stated here, we must save time because we can not stay here any longer, and as we have had our experiences, those of us who have been organizing and those of us who have been organized, we see that by this constitution we can begin to shed the bad features of this constitution and adopt those which are good. When we begin to read over the entire report of the Constitution Committee we simply have the whole reading, and we don't know what it refers to after it has all been done. We simply have a skeleton as it stands here, with

the recommendation by the Constitution Committee, and adopt what suits us best.

DEL. HOLMES: As a delegate who seconded that amendment, I wish to state that while I am thoroughly in accord with that first paragraph I wish to have a clear understanding of all that matter that has been submitted at this present time. Now I fail to hear any reason advanced for the not reading of it beyond the fact that we were consuming time. I want to say that we are consuming a great deal more time now in the discussion. The thing could be read in a short time, and we could act intelligently. We would have a general idea of it and then we could take up the clauses. Whether we have to vote on it as a whole afterwards cuts absolutely no figure in this proposition. I like to vote intelligently myself, and I would like to have it read.

DEL. CRONIN: I am in favor of the amendment to an extent, but the amendment does not go far enough. I contend that the proper proceeding will be to listen to the report of the Committee on Constitution, as far as they have accepted it and agreed that they will submit it to this organization. Then it would give the membership of the convention an opportunity before they pass on it at all to pick out the various things that will be submitted by the Constitution committee, and when their full report, when they are ready to report in full, that this convention will go into a committee of the whole for the purpose of considering the different clauses of the constitution seriatim, and adopt it as a whole. Then we will have a constitution. But in this way we are consuming time. I could then say that I could vote for this particular clause, and the next one I would be opposed to, and I would know how I wanted to vote at the general consideration of the subject. I believe this amendment does not cover it in its entirety. I believe I shall make a substitute motion, if you will accept such a thing. If you will accept it I will make a substitute motion, that we listen to the reading of the report of the constitution committee, as far as they are ready to report without action; and that when their full report is in that we go into a committee of the whole to consider the constitution seriatim. Motion seconded.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: It has been regularly moved and seconded as a substitute motion that we proceed to hear the reading of the report of the Constitution Committee, until such time as they are through with their amendments to the entire constitution; that then we resolve into a committee of the whole and act on the same seriatim. Delegate Veal has got the floor, as we are not speaking on the other motion any longer.

DEL. VEAL: Mr. Chairman and Fellow Delegates: I am opposed to the substitute. I am opposed to the amendment. I concur in the motion brought before the convention by the Constitution Committee. Now we have come to a point where we are face to face with the forces of revolution, and the forces, on the other hand, of reaction. I am opposed to this thing going any further. We have our minds made up, and you have decided in the former action of this convention that the transportation department was a paper proposition, that it was illegal. You have decided that the Metal Department was in the hands of the reactionists, and the rank and file were sent here to protest against the officials in the Metal Department. Hence, those who take that position represent the expression of the rank and file, and I see no reason why we ought to support the substitute, the amendment. But let us take a vote and see whether we are going to stand for the position of concurring in the motion, whereby if we stand for this first clause there will be no departments as stated today, but we stand for the ten thou-



sand proposition. Let us take a vote and put an end to this monkey business. We are up against it now and we may as well get through.

DEL. SIMS: Mr. Chairman and Fellow Delegates: It seems strange to me that these delegates who are introducing amendments, as well as the substitute, claim to have a clear conception of parliamentary usage. It seems strange that they are afraid of this supposed bugaboo. Now, concurring or voting in the affirmative to concur in this motion can be had at any time that this convention sees fit. They can reconsider any motion that they may have formerly taken. In fact, I can not see where we are wasting energy, or wasting time, unless we do adopt this proposition. We don't want to waste time. Our energies are now worn out. We are now on the very *qui vive*, and our energies are gone, and we know that we have got our hands in the wage slave's pocket, and we want to take it out. We don't want to waste time, and we can certainly avoid wasting time by concurring in the proposition as submitted by the Constitution Committee. That don't mean to say by any means, that we have adopted this constitution, or even adopted that clause. But if we will endeavor to facilitate matters we can concur in this proposition, and go on to the next, and the next, and so on down, and let the Constitution Committee bring in the balance of the clause, and we can concur in it until we get to the last one. Any proposition which we have submitted, and any motion which we have adopted, which will conflict with former motions, then if we are intelligent enough to know what we should do we can rescind such actions as we have taken formerly. That is absolutely in keeping with parliamentary usage, and I can not see for the life of me why the others who claim to have a clear concept of parliamentary usage, can not see that that way. Now, I hold it will facilitate time, and we are carrying this thing through in the proper manner, if we concur in the former motion; hence, I am absolutely opposed to the amendment, and also to the substitute.

It has been shown to me, without any scruples of doubt, that if we are going to read over that whole constitution, and then get up to act upon it, we will have delegates here on the floor getting up and talking upon something that appeared in the latter part of the constitution, something that appeared in the middle part of the constitution, something that appeared all through the constitution, and will never talk upon the real question at issue.

Now, the very first clause that was submitted here, there were delegates jumping up on the floor and beginning to talk about referendum, and delegates jumping up on the floor and beginning to talk on other things. They did not hew right to the line. They do not come to the point. If we vote and go through that whole constitution, if you allow that committee to submit all of the questions which they have got there, you are going to have delegates jumping upon the floor, talking about that whole entire proposition as submitted there, and none of them will talk about the real question at issue. Hence, you will be absolutely wasting energy and time, and keep us sitting here at this very same point.

DEL. FITZGERALD: This man has talked on this question three times. We have not had a chance, and we have been laying down and waiting for a chance, to talk on this; and therefore, I think that every delegate should have a chance to talk on this.

A DELEGATE: On what?

DEL. FITZGERALD: On the proposition that is before the house. And that three or four should not jump up and do all the talking here.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The Chair would rule that the delegate

has not spoken on the motion before the house. The substitute is the property of the house at this time, and the only property that the house has got. And if it is carried it does away with all others; if it is defeated, it leaves the others open.

DEL. LINGENFELTER: I want to warn this convention, without making any speech, that if that substitute is carried, which ends up with going into a committee of the whole, it will permit the obstructors an unlimited time to prolong this convention, because it wipes out the rules and leaves us in the same shape we were last week. And I would appeal to the common sense of the delegates to vote that substitute down. It don't give them any opportunity to get any hold upon this convention again. Stick to the convention. Don't go into a committee of the whole.

(Cries of "Previous question.")

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Del. St. John has got the floor.

DEL. ST. JOHN: Well, I will move the previous question.

(Cries of "Roll call.")

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The secretary will proceed to call the roll on whether or not the previous question shall be now put. Those wishing that it be put will vote yes; those wishing to discuss it further will vote no. The previous question is the substitute.

Thereupon a vote was taken with the following result: Total vote, 636; Yes, 398½; No, 237½.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The motion is carried for the previous question. Your vote now occurs on the substitute, which is that this convention continue to hear the report of your Constitution Committee until they have submitted their entire amendment to the Constitution; that then you go into a committee of the whole and take that up seriatim for consideration. The secretary will proceed to call the roll.

Thereupon a vote was taken with the following result: Total vote, 640; Yes, 269; No, 371.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The substitute motion is lost. The vote now occurs on the motion that the committee continue to read what amendments they have in their possession at this time, and that they be taken up seriatim. The secretary will proceed to call the roll.

Thereupon a vote was taken with the following result: Total vote, 593; Yes, 279; No, 314.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The motion is lost. The vote now occurs on the motion to adopt the amendment to Section 1 of Article 1, as offered by your committee. The secretary will proceed to call the roll.

The roll was called and resulted as follows: Total vote, 631; Yes, 373½; No, 257½.

Del. French not voting.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The motion to adopt the report of the committee on the amendment of Section 1, Article I, is carried.

The report of the Committee on Constitution was continued.

DEL. KINNEALLY: The clause or paragraph that we took up for consideration was Section 1, Article II, which reads as follows:

"The officers of the Industrial Workers of the World shall be a General President, a General Secretary-Treasurer and a General Executive Board composed of the above-named officers and one from each International Department."

We recommend or propose to amend by striking out the words "General President" and inserting after the words "General Secretary-Treasurer" the words "an Assistant General Secretary-Treasurer," and striking out the words "International," the second last word in the sentence,

and putting in its place the word "Industrial." Now, the section as amended is:

"The officers of the Industrial Workers of the World shall be a General Secretary-Treasurer, an Assistant General Secretary-Treasurer, and a General Executive Board composed of the above-named officers and one member from each Industrial Department."

DEL. DE LEON: I move you to concur. (Seconded). I wish to speak on the purpose of that amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Wait till I state the motion, Del. DeLeon. It has been regularly moved and supported that we concur in the recommendations of the committee.

DEL. DE LEON: The purpose of that motion is obvious, and obvious also is the reasoning by which it was arrived at. The principal change is the abolition of the office of president. The Committee on Constitution considered that at this stage of the movement and of this organization the president is mainly, essentially and exclusively an organizer, a general organizer, with a high-sounding title and wages and expenses to match. As Delegate Pinkerton stated last week, if we have not got the funds to support a king we might as well use the funds to support ourselves. The Committee on Constitution considered that the work of the organization can be performed excellently without an officer having that title and the necessary wages and expenses to match.

The next portion of the amendment is with regard to the General Secretary-Treasurer. The committee was of the opinion—is of the opinion—that the duties of that office are too multitudinous for any one man to attend to. We were not entirely at one as to whether the General Secretary-Treasurer should have an assistant General Secretary-Treasurer, or whether we should ourselves divide the offices and call one a General Financial Secretary and the other a General Corresponding Secretary. The majority vote prevailed as reported—a General Secretary-Treasurer and an Assistant General Secretary-Treasurer, leaving it to the General Secretary-Treasurer to divide the work as he deems best. For these reasons I move that we concur. (Seconded.)

DEL. McKINNON: Mr. President, as a member of that committee I wish to state that when this matter was brought up I of course opposed it on certain grounds, and the majority of this committee came to this conclusion on the assumption that there was not a man in this convention strong enough or capable enough to assume the office of president. That is all I have got to say.

DEL. PARKS: Mr. President, I rise to express my ideas, but I will not offer any amendment, but only make suggestions. My idea is that before we get an automatic administrative body of the working class revolutionary movement we will have to become more democratic than this report of the Constitutional Committee indicates that it is possible for us to do at this time. Now, it would be possible, if we did get a good Executive Board of all the members of these departments and we went on organizing at a rate which would meet the fullest hope and expectancy of the enthusiastic organizers and supporters of the revolutionary movement, that the capitalist class would swoop down upon this General Executive Board like the Russian capitalists did last November in Russia and put them all in jail, and then where would the I. W. W. be?

DEL. McINTOSH: They would be in jail.

DEL. PARKS: Now, as I say, I am going to express my views, and maybe at some future convention these ideas may be made use of. It seems to me we ought to have a General Executive Board so formed that any thousand or ten thousand members located in any industrial

center, whatever we might determine upon, would have the power themselves, at any time when there was a vacancy occurring on the General Executive Board, to select a member for this great General Executive Board, which might consist of as many as sixty members, or you might keep it as low as twenty members or raise it to as many members as you would require to have a member on the General Executive Board. This General Board would elect of their own membership a special administrative board who would be located or come together as business required at the general headquarters to transact the special business that needed personal attention, subject to a general referendum to the General Executive Board. I believe that we ought to have a board that would reflect the condition of the labor movement all over the country, so that in case a few of the members of the General Executive Board would be swooped down on and put into jail or the pen or the penitentiary, that the members of the rank and file throughout the country could fill their places by a referendum vote, and in that way by a general referendum of the Executive Board we could get a special executive board to administer affairs so that there would not be any danger of being thrown into confusion. Those are my ideas. I will not vote upon this question as proposed by the Committee on Constitution, although I will not oppose it by any constitutional amendment at this time. I do not see how we are going to prevent the corruption that arose with the last General Executive Board from arising again. If we have this general board—

DEL. McCABE: Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. The Executive Board is not on trial, and I will not sit here as a member of the General Executive Board and be assailed by you or any other delegate. Now, understand that thoroughly.

DEL. PARKS: I am not assailing you.

DEL. McCABE: You are assailing me and the whole of the members of the Executive Board.

A DELEGATE: I rise to a point of order. This is all not in order.

DEL. McCABE: You have gone far enough right now. If you want to start the ball, start it.

DEL. CRONIN: Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order.

DEL. PARKS: If I say anything—

DEL. CRONIN: Do I understand you to mean that there was corruption as shown by the official files of the board, or just to leave the insinuation that there was corruption on the General Executive Board? It is either one or the other, and I want to have a trial. If the General Executive Board was corrupted we want to know why and how.

DEL. PARKS: I will modify my statement by making it that it is the general opinion of the members of the revolutionary element of this convention that there was among some of the departments of the Industrial Workers of the World corruption, graft and fakiration which would put to shame the worst of the A. F. of L.

DEL. CRONIN: I want to know what it is.

DEL. PARKS: I have no reflection to make on anybody.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Your time is up.

DEL. PARKS: All right.

DEL. CRONIN: I want to know what this corruption is.

DEL. AUGUSTINE: I am in favor of the motion. I agree with the Constitution Committee that there is not a man on the floor of this convention, nor any man in sight unless he be in the Ada County jail, that is capable of filling the office of president of this organization. Past experiences in this organization have convinced me that I am correct. Now, with regard to the General Secretary, if we were to take Bro. Trautmann, I admit that Bro. Trautmann is the best executive

officer on the old board. If we were to place Trautmann in the position of president I believe that he could fill it, but I believe that Bro. Trautmann is better where he is now as General Secretary.

DEL. GOLDBERG: A point of order.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: State your point of order.

DEL. GOLDBERG: My point of order is that the Constitution Committee did not bring in anything in reference to placing anybody in nomination for officers now.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The point of order is well taken.

DEL. AUGUSTINE: It don't make any difference; I can use concrete terms as well as abstract. Now, the Executive Board will be taken care of in the next clause, and that is all I wanted to say on this subject.

DEL. COX: Mr. President, just a few words. I am in favor of the adoption of this as standing opposed to a general president of this organization. I do not want to be personal in any of my remarks. I just want to say that whether it was C. O. Sherman or whatever member or name it may have been, it was not the individual's fault, the failing of this first president, because the old constitution that we made last year made an autocrat out of the office. Therefore, upon the ground that the old constitution gave the president a chance to become an autocrat, I oppose it.

DEL. TULLAR: Mr. President, I want in a way to corroborate the statements of Del. Cox. Like Del. Cox, I shall not indulge in personalities, and I defy any member to say that in all my contentions on this floor or in the past I have indulged in personalities. But I want to say here, first, that I am not a reformer. I believe in revolution, and I believe that where we create an opportunity for any individual to become an autocrat, then we are not wiping out autocracy by changing individuals. I do not care who the individual may be, myself or any other, if the autocratic power exists, that individual will take advantage of that fact. Hence the only way for us to abolish autocracy is to abolish the opportunity, and you can only abolish the opportunity by abolishing the office.

DEL. DUMAS: If we abolish the president I am in favor of abolishing the power of that office. But will you not abolish that power by abolishing the office of president? If we have a department of 10,000 members how many will be represented on the General Executive Board? And also we might have the best president in the world, but we might leave power in the hands of two or three men. Therefore I voted a few minutes ago in favor of retaining the whole power in the committee, because you can fill up a vacancy and you can fill the presidency and you can elect them from some other department. That is all I want to say.

DEL. McMULLEN: Mr. President, as I understand it, we are abolishing the office of president of this organization and substituting in place two secretaries, one secretary to be known as the General Secretary and the other subservient to him. Now, it is clear, as far as this has gone, as we have not yet reached a description of what will constitute the duties of either of those secretaries proposed to be elected, that the duties of the Secretary or his assistant will be administrative. Now, it is a question right here of splitting hairs, or splitting terms I better say, because if the duties of the General Secretary are those of the now general president, there is nothing to be gained in this contention of abolishing the office of president, and up to this time not one single word has been said to show that this organization can get along without somebody who will act as the director-general of this institution. Whether you make it a general secretary-treasurer or general

president is absolutely immaterial to me as to what the term shall be. That you have got to have. You can call him king, czar, president or anything you care to—president or secretary, I don't care what. But he has got to perform the duties laid down in this constitution or any constitution you may adopt, and it will be of an administrative character. Now, that cannot be denied; that cannot in any sense be denied. I can say too, here, and say with some force and effect, that the judgment we are passing upon this, the destroying of this office, is one of those things that we are at this time unable to understand from the manner and form in which you force us to consider this, without knowing what shall come in hereafter. We do not know what the duties of these two proposed officers will be. We do not know how they are going to perform those duties; we are in the dark, and compelled, knowing what we have got, knowing the evils under which we do now exist, we are compelled to prefer those in this life, and not seek those of the hereafter until we come to them. Many might see the application of that. And I cannot intelligently vote for this plan, for we do not know what that General Secretary-Treasurer's duties are and who is going to perform them. Nor do I know anything about the Assistant Secretary's duties, and I do not know who is going to perform them, and I am compelled to vote in the negative upon what possibly might be a meritorious proposition, but you force me to remain in this state of ignorance in voting upon this thing. It was not of my own volition that I am in this situation. You would compel me by the roll call vote to try and destroy what I now have and substitute something that I know nothing whatever about, when my own judgment tells me that there must be a general officer and a general administrative officer. We must have it. Now, I want to say this is an appealing to those who know the man and which I can authenticate if it is necessary—not on this floor at this time; but Moyer told me that it was absolutely essential that there be a good administrative officer at the head of this organization. And I say to you, my brothers, in all sincerity, I don't care what the term is, there has not been one single thing said here that would justify the changing of terms from general president to general secretary if the duties are the same. I believe that there are a number of men in this institution, taking it for granted that the minority report from that committee will be adopted—that there are a number of men on this floor who could perform the duties as now prescribed in the constitution and do themselves absolute justice. In the face of this fact, notwithstanding all the allegations here made, not one single vote of censure, not one single charge was proved that there was one particle of corruption or czarism in the past or present executive board or in any of the officers of any department of this organization, and if there is, put them out.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Your time is up.

DEL. McMULLEN: Thank you.

DEL. FRENCH: Mr. Chairman, I vote for this proposition owing to the fact that my organization instructed me to vote for the abolition of general president—and by the way, of the office of president throughout the entire organization also, in its subdivisions—and I will state my reasons. They are these: that the general president is simply an ornament. I had nothing against our present president. It is not because this or that or some other individual occupies the chair, but I as well as some of my local hold that the position is not necessary, and we furthermore hold that that position may some day prove dangerous to your organization. I will grant that nothing has been brought up as to our president, nothing serious, nothing dangerous. He has not proven himself a czar or an autocrat, and I do not mean to imply that

if he were continued in office he would become a tyrant; but the office is there and the opportunity is there and it is not necessary. I claim that the work that is laid out for the president can be done by an efficient Executive Board, and the fact that that is not gone over and that you do not know how it is to be done does not prove that a president is necessary. However, it has not been shown on the other side of the house to what extent a president is necessary for an organization, and until such time that you prove that he is necessary I would be compelled to vote against that office.

DEL. McMULLEN: I could very well have explained that if I had had the time. We have not half the time. We were not allowed to give our reasons. We could show reasons if allowed the time.

DEL. DE LEON: Mr. President—

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: You had the floor once.

DEL. DE LEON: I have a right to close the debate if they are through.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: You have no right to close the debate for a little while. There was a delegate over there that gave way. I would like to have the floor myself before we close the debate.

PRESIDENT SHERMAN: Mahoney wants the floor.

President Sherman took the chair.

DEL. MAHONEY: Mr. Chairman and Fellow Delegates, I am of the opinion, at this time, that it is absolutely necessary that there be a general head to this organization. I don't believe that you would at all be avoiding these difficulties by taking the powers that you have placed in the office of general president and adding them to a man as general secretary that you have already given powers. If this will not add autocracy then I don't know what the definition of it is. You are going to take the position through this amendment of adding together the duties of two offices and relying altogether on the integrity of one man.

A DELEGATE: That is correct.

DEL. MAHONEY: I hold that there never was an organization founded without a head. I believe in having a general head to an organization, and I believe when that general head is not fair to his constituency they should remove him and establish a general head that is, and as one member of this organization I am opposed to doing away with the office of president, and I am here representing a man who is today in the Ada County Jail who has been referred to as being in favor of doing away with this office, and I want to serve notice on you now that he has already notified me that that shall stand above all things. So don't refer to him any longer. Further, I want to tell the delegates that if it is the consensus of opinion of this convention that their inability prohibits them from acting in the interest of their class, then I say they should adjourn. If there are any such representatives of the working class on this floor as the contention has been on the part of some of the delegates, then I say they are dishonest in deliberating. If it is your integrity you wish to maintain I advise that you instruct your constituencies to elect men that have the intelligence. This is my position, pure and clear. I have no personal object at all to advance against any delegate on this floor, but I have one statement to make, that the next delegate on this floor who refers to the General Executive Board will have to name the member of the board and make charges. If it is me I want to know it, and if it is somebody else I am not going to be accused.

DEL. PARKS: Mr. President, a question of personal privilege.

THE CHAIRMAN: State your question of personal privilege.

DEL. PARKS: I stated here that it was the general consensus of

opinion of the revolutionary element of this convention that there was corruption, fakiration and bad conduct on the part of the General Executive Board of the I. W. W. that would put to shame the fakirs in the A. F. of L., and I stand here now ready to state my opinion as I have heard it expressed by many members of this convention, that their grafting proposition comes from no other part of the house as much as the Transportation Department of the Industrial Workers that was submitted to the Committee of the Whole, according to the opinion that was expressed by many members in this convention. I don't care if any member of the Executive Board of the Industrial Workers of the World was hurt. I made my remarks about this matter of the General Executive Board as outlined, and I suggested that it would not cure the troubles that arose here and that were brought up and took a week's time in the preliminary organization of this convention in the tangle that we got into, and that you all know. I stand ready at all times to give you proof.

DEL. VEAL: Mr. Chairman and Fellow Delegates, I stand opposed to a president of the Industrial Workers of the World, due to the fact that he does not perform the function that was stated here, that he directs the work of this organization. I ask you delegates, can you, a man who is in Canada, a man who is in Pittsburgh, receive communications from this organization and direct the field work? Is it not a fact that the pure-and-simplers today have built up false gods and told us a Mitchell or Gompers has come to town and we plain people and the slaves go and see them do their stunts? We, the Industrial Workers of the World as slaves, are going to take away that thing, are going to take away the halo which stands in the way of progress, and we are going to say to the organizers of this organization that we are tired of this proposition where a man is put up and says that he is the man, but we are going to take that money that is paid for sending men from one place to another and make them go into the industrial centers and there meet the rank and file face to face, stand on the street corners, and when the questions are asked answer them from a class standpoint. We care not what the opinion of one man may be. We take the position here that if there is to be any directing then a man must be here in the office; that the general secretary-treasurer can function in that office and answer the communications, and the other work that is to be done must be done by the organizers.

One of the slaves who left this convention, Dillon, from Evansville, Indiana, who was blacklisted—blacklisted in St. Louis, blacklisted in Evansville, wrote a letter to the general office and asked the question how much salary do these men get, and when the list was run down it was found to be \$1,800 a year to \$10 a week for wage slaves who were carrying the message to the proletariat. Right there he said, "That thing doesn't stand for my class and I will refuse to uphold an institution that gives recognition to officialdom directly in opposition to the principles of the Industrial Workers of the World." And I asked President Sherman the proposition, on arriving in Chicago, in his office I asked him the question as to what was the difference between the president and an organizer; and that is the question that is up to us today, "Where is the difference?" We have got to sever our connection right now from officialdom and make a clean sweep of it. It has been admitted here that the rank and file are capable of selecting their own organizers who can deliver the message to the proletariat at any time they desire.

DEL. REID: I have listened this afternoon to what I have heard resounding all through fakirdom, and that is an attempt to put up before us a man and that we get down and worship him. Bro. McMul-



len talks to us about the guiding hand and Bro. Mahoney talks about the general president in the same strain; a "director-general" is what they want us to have. I absolutely deny that any man guides this Industrial Workers of the World. I am not prepared to take up this General Executive Board because I don't know what is to follow; I will admit that. But on the question of the president I deny that the president is the whole cheese. He has not got it in him; no man directs this Industrial Workers of the World. As Comrade Veal has said, how could a man in Canada or down in Florida, if he is down there, direct the Industrial Workers of the World? Why, it is a piece of nonsense. The people who direct the industrial Workers of the World are the rank and file, through whatever you may call it which represents the central administration. Now, in a multitude of counsellors there is wisdom, and wisdom is not in the brain of one man to direct this institution. I stand opposed to a president. It is an expensive luxury. We have working men asking the same question. "What do you call this? \$200 a month for expenses; \$5.00 a day and big expenses?" Why, that simply is a sort of rehash of A. F. of L.-dom. That is the proposition that is before us. Now, then, we have to take this thing that is trying to be built up and we are asked to get down and worship them as the "All-Wisdom" necessary to direct this organization. We have got to take a stand here and say no; that no man directs the Industrial Workers of the World; he is not big enough; the man is not born that is big enough. The wisdom lies in the collective wisdom of the rank and file. There is where the wisdom to direct this working class organization, this revolutionary organization of the working class, lies, and nowhere else. The question of these large salaries is a paramount question with us. I am from a city where the men are keeping families of ten or eleven on seven or eight dollars a week, and I tell you they don't want men who will come and stay at three or four or five dollar hotels and drink the best liquors. Not on your tin-type. They are looking for the men who will come and face them—

A DELEGATE: A point of order. He is not discussing the point.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Brother McCabe has the floor.

DEL. McCABE: Hasn't President Sherman asked for the floor?

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Yes, President Sherman has asked for the floor a number of times.

DEL. DE LEON: Mr. President, I rise to a point of order. My point is this: This convention by roll call has established the fact that nothing shall be a department with less than 10,000 members. By that action, taken with a full knowledge of what it meant, by that action the foundation is taken from the ground on which Del. McCabe has a claim to a seat in this convention; consequently McCabe is not a delegate in this convention. I ask for a ruling on that point.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The Chair would rule that the request is out of order.

DEL. DE LEON: It was a point of order that I raised.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Well, I would take it that the point was not well taken.

DEL. DE LEON: I appeal from the decision of the Chair. I will state my reasons. The constitution provided that there should be 3,000 members to a department. Upon the strength of that certain departments were accepted, they claiming that they had the necessary number. I shall not here go into the question of whether they kept up that number and what the effect of it would be. This convention, however, has decided, when it voted by a majority of over 120 votes by a roll call, that a department shall consist of not less than 10,000 members. That is new legislation; a new basis was thereby estab-

lished. Last year's convention, realizing that there would not be the necessary representatives from the thirteen departments because there were only three that said they were departments—adopted a resolution that the General Executive Board shall consist of one member from each department, and two others were elected at large. Thereby the Metal Workers' Department and McCabe's department—I shall have to speak of McCabe at present—McCabe's department elected him to the G. E. B. By the constitution a member of the G. E. B. is ipso facto a delegate to this convention. By the action of this convention the ground has been taken from under McCabe as a delegate. This convention having decided that it takes a 10,000 membership for a department, it follows that there is today no representative of the Transportation Department in the G. E. B. As there is no representative of the Transportation Department in the G. E. B. nobody can be a delegate to this body, to this convention, with a right to the floor who is not on the G. E. B. and by virtue either of his having a department behind him or having been elected by a general vote of this convention. McCabe is on the G. E. B. not by a general vote of this convention; he is on the G. E. B. by virtue of there having been a department according to the then constitution. The present constitution establishes 10,000 members as a minimum. It follows that the pedestal on which McCabe stood and through which he entered the G. E. B. has been broken down. It follows, consequently, that all the rights and perquisites of that office fall with him. For that reason I claim that McCabe and Kirkpatrick—but I will speak of McCabe at present—that McCabe is no longer a member of the G. E. B. and consequently is no longer a delegate to this convention, by the action of this convention.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem (Del. Mahoney): Del. De Leon takes an appeal from the decision of the Chair on the ground that the report of the Constitution Committee on Article I, Sections 1 and 2, was adopted. His contention is that the adoption of this amendment does away immediately with the Transportation Department and the Department of Metal and Machinery. The Chair ruled that his position was not well taken. My reason for making the ruling was that I did not believe this convention had decided as yet to unseat the representatives who are here from the Transportation Department and the Metal and Machinery Department. My contention is that if there is no department of Metal and Machinery, neither of Transportation, connected with the Industrial Workers of the World, or recognized today, that there are no delegates who come here from the Metal and Machinery Department and the Transportation Department who are entitled to sit on this floor. Should his contention be the consensus of opinion of this convention, my contention is that there are no local unions connected with the Industrial Workers of the World from those departments at all, neither from the Transportation nor the Metal and Machinery Department. On the other hand, I contend that the adoption of this amendment by a vote of this convention did not make it a law, neither will I recognize it as a law until it is submitted to a referendum vote of the rank and file of the entire organization. I recognize, fellow delegates, that I have a constituency to report to. I know the sentiment expressed by that constituency in their convention, and I am here for the purpose of carrying out that expression as far as I am able. Thus I make my ruling. My ruling has been appealed from. The question now is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand. Those voting yes sustain the Chair. Those voting no vote to unseat the delegates. The Secretary will proceed to call the roll.

The roll call was taken on the appeal, and resulted as follows: Total vote, 631; yes, 301; no, 331.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The Chair is not sustained. Del. De Leon's contention prevails, and I suppose McCabe is no longer a delegate on the floor.

DEL. DE LEON: Comrade Chairman—

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Del. Sherman has got the floor.

PRES. SHERMAN: I want to talk on the amendment to the constitution.

DEL. McMULLEN: Before Brother Sherman talks I want to ask, does that disqualify McCabe and Kirkpatrick and Maichele, Kohl and all these other delegates from the Department? I am asking the Chair.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: That was the statement that the Chair made, that in his opinion it did. That was the ruling, that it would disqualify all of them.

DEL. MAICHELE: I have a letter here in my possession that will verify that I am a representative from the Industrial Workers of the City of Schenectady in the State of New York, if anybody wants to call for it.

DEL. FRENCH: I rise to a point of order, that the general understanding, or my own understanding, on the seating of the delegates from the Transportation and the Metal and Machinery locals was that we allow Del. Kohl and Maichele.

DEL. DE LEON: I rise to a point of order.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: State your point of order.

DEL. DE LEON: My point of order is that if this delegate is allowed to speak in that way the whole question is reopened. This question has been settled on an appeal from the decision of the Chair; the appeal was decided, and we cannot now reopen it for discussion.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The point is well taken.

DEL. HAVER: I cannot understand how you can entertain two points of order at one time. Del. French raised a point of order, and you deliberately gave Del. De Leon the floor on the same thing. Why don't you allow this man (indicating Del. French) to state his point of order first? I don't think it is right to entertain anybody else's point of order before his.

DEL. FRENCH: The only thing I wanted to make a point of order on was on this contention: I understand your ruling to mean that in ruling out McCabe on sustaining Comrade De Leon's appeal you ruled out the others. The point I wanted to make was that I believe the understanding of this convention was that those men were seated in order to give representation in this convention to the membership of the I. W. W. embodied in a so-called department, and the ruling you gave on McCabe did not rule out Kohl and Maichele.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The contention of Del. De Leon, if I understand it right, was that there was no further department. My contention was that if there was no further department there was no right of representation of the department by any one who came here through the tax paid by that department.

DEL. FRENCH: That does not make clear the point. The point I raised was this, that we seated all those men called musicians for the purpose of giving representation; not recognizing the department, but giving representation to the members of the Metal and Machinery, the Transportation and the Musicians, for the express purpose of giving representation to that membership, and not for recognizing the department. Question called for.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Del. Sherman has got the floor.

PRES. SHERMAN: I want to speak on the amendment as offered by your committee. According to the reading of that amendment as

offered you would have, unless they have got something in the dark—they don't seem to dare to read this work that is coming to us—up to where they have read they only would have, according to the wording, three members on the Executive Board. They would be, one from the Mining Department, one general secretary-treasurer, and one an assistant general secretary-treasurer. There would be three men on that Executive Board. Now, why do you want an Executive Board? Why would Brother Mahoney or anybody else want to represent the Mining Department and have no colleague there from any other place, only a general secretary-treasurer and an assistant general secretary-treasurer elected from the rank and file? Del. Veal says that they are going to make the organizers go into the industrial centers. Who is going to make them? He says we are going to make them go into the industrial centers and organize. There is nobody of authority in the organization. They are going to control their own affairs. I suppose when the ribbon workers need money in New York they are going to make the secretary send them \$1,000 strike benefits, and on the same day if they are on strike in Missoula they are going to make them send \$1,000 there because they are the rank and file and they are going to make their servants do this. Now, be sane; don't get crazy. Recognizing, as I do, that the rank and file of the taxpaying members of this organization are not all represented here; recognizing the fact that the point of order that was raised or the appeal settles the question that the rank and file are not going to put their seal of approval or rejection upon the deliberation of this body, that vote says that we have no referendum vote. That appeal does not decide the question here that the rank and file are not going to have an opportunity to say that the deliberations here suit them or not.

I want to say to you right here, and serve notice on you, that I am not asking anything of this convention or anything of the Industrial Workers of the World. I did not ask for the position that I have occupied, and I do not ask for anything now. There is nothing in your keeping that I am looking for, only this: I ask you to submit to the rank and file that is going to and has supported this organization an opportunity either to endorse or reject your work in this convention, and if you do I will assure you that the rank and file will turn it down flat. And Mr. De Leon does not dare to go to the rank and file; he does not. I defy you to ask us to go to the rank and file and ask an endorsement. You daren't do it. You are a coward, and you daren't leave the decision to the rank and file.

DEL. DE LEON. A point of order. I demand a retraction of that word as unparliamentary.

PRES. SHERMAN: You daren't leave it to the rank and file, the deliberations of this convention, and I leave my work to the rank and file for their endorsement or rejection.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The convention will have to come to order.

PRES. SHERMAN: I came to the convention of the Western Federation of Miners, and I heard their expression and what they wanted the rank and file to do.

DEL. COX: Mr. Chairman, a point of order. The Western Federation of Miners are not under discussion.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: You are discussing the motion, I believe, now.

DEL. COX: Rule on that point of order.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: I have already ruled, and you are out of order, too, you are, on a point of order. I am not here to answer questions all the time.

PRES. SHERMAN: When I am speaking of the rank and file I am speaking of the Western Federation of Miners and all other departments.

THE CHAIRMAN, pro tem: The Chair has ruled that the discussion occurs on the motion before the house. I hope the delegate will confine himself to the motion before the house.

PRES. SHERMAN: I think if the committee had been fair they would have willingly read the whole. They may make provision later on as to how this Board is to be filled up, but as yet not even the committee has told us that it made any other provision. You have got it up to you. They have named your three men that are going to be on the G. B.—that is, the Grand Bounce, the G. B. There are going to be three there. Now, that is as far as you know. Whether there are going to be any more than three or not, we do not know. They may have made provision, but they don't tell you what.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Del. Sherman, your time is up.

PRES. SHERMAN: I am glad of it.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: You have had the floor five minutes.

DEL. SHENKAN: I give him five minutes of my time.

(Objection by delegates.)

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Is there any objection to a delegate delegating his time to the other?

(Objection heard.)

DEL. RICHTER: Mr. Chairman, as my constituents instructed me to abolish the office of president, I am in favor of abolishing that office, but not for the reason that there were no capable men within the I. W. W. for that office. We have arrived at the conclusion that the office of president was unnecessary, because we held that the power rested with the entire membership; that from the experience we had last year it was evident that nothing could be gained by retaining that office. It is contrary to the spirit underlying the Industrial Workers of the World, consequently, we are opposed to the office. But from the paragraph as amended by the committee it is evident that the Executive Committee at the present time would consist of the two secretaries and a member from one of the departments now in existence, making up three. Now, I hold that it would be bad policy to have the administrative officers be also the executive officers. We recognize, or at least the organization should recognize, as one of the fundamental principles of a class conscious organization that the condition is one, in the present shape, for thought and action. We may grant that some men can put themselves above the immediate influence of their economic condition. Yet, nevertheless, this organization ought not to take any chances on that score. I would hold that the suggestions made by one of the members of our Executive Committee, Del. Riordan, should be the one to be considered, and I would hold that it would fit our requirements; that it would give us an Executive Board which would control, change and amend the actions of our administrative officers. The administrative officers might have a voice in stating the condition of the organization, but they should have no vote. They are employees and the Executive Board should represent the organization and control the actions of the administrative officers, and consequently I am opposed to the paragraph as presented by the committee.

I would move as an amendment to the motion under consideration, that it be resubmitted to the committee with a recommendation that they insert a provision that the Executive Committee shall be made up of men not administrative officers.

DEL. KINNEALLY: Will you consider this motion?

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: If somebody seconds it. I did not

hear any second. (Motion seconded.) It has been regularly moved and supported that this section be referred back to the committee. You have heard the motion as stated; are you ready for the question?

DEL. KINNEALLY: We are not on the question of the formation of the Executive Board. We are not on the question as to who shall be members of the Executive Board or not. We recognize today, by the action of this convention, that we have expelled two or three men from that Executive Board. This committee is giving a presentation that will place the executive for the coming year in proper shape, and we are only on the question as to whether we shall abolish the office of president or not. That is the only question that is before us. The other question will come up as to the formation of the Executive Board and how they shall be elected, and so forth, and so on.

DEL. VEAL: I move the previous question.

DELEGATES: No.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The previous question has been called for.

DEL. McMULLEN: It was not seconded.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Then this delegate has the floor, and then Del. McMullen, as they were both on the floor prior to the moving of the previous question.

DEL. FOOTE: A point of information. Was that motion for the previous question seconded?

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Yes.

DELEGATES: No.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Yes.

DEL. FOOTE: Will the second please stand up, so that I may see who it is?

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: There were two or three voices of members seconding the motion, heard distinctly by me.

DEL. FOOTE: Nobody stands up to second it, and I should think if no one stands up to second it now, that it should fall.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Do you say that I am at fault?

DEL. FOOTE: "That it should fall."

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: I am satisfied for it to fall. Is there a second?

DEL. DE LEON: A point of order. Will you allow me to state a point of order? I understood you to say a minute ago that the previous question was called. Two delegates had risen from their seats, and consequently you would have to give them a hearing. I wish to call attention to the fact that we are working under special rules providing that the mover of a motion has a right to close; consequently the previous question cannot be put. I suggest that.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The delegate will proceed.

DEL. MOSKOVITZ: I shall say but a few words to the question before the house. The question before the house is not the question of the election of the Executive Board or how it shall be composed. The question before the house is, Shall the general president be done away with? That is the question before the house. And, Shall an assistant secretary-treasurer be added to the general secretary-treasurer? As far as I can understand, that is the only question before the house. As far as the formation of the General Executive Board is concerned or whether we shall have a general Executive Board, that is not the question just now. The question is simply, Shall we do away with that officer and substitute another in that place?

DEL. FOOTE: A point of information on that question—

DEL. McMULLEN: As I understand the matter, the motion is to refer this back to the committee, is it not?

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Yes.

DEL. FOOTE: A point of information is in order at all times.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: You did not raise a point of information that I know of.

DEL. FOOTE: If the president is abolished will President Sherman be expelled as a delegate?

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The question is asked, If this amendment carries will it expel President Sherman from the convention? The Chair would rule that it would not, as I do not recognize the passage of any of this constitution until after it is submitted to a referendum vote. The Chair rules that it will not. I ruled that way in the other case, but was overruled. Del. McMullen has the floor.

DEL. McMULLEN: Mr. President, as I understand the motion, it was to recommit and refer it back to the committee. Now, I do not think I should claim the floor on the question of the merits of whether this should or should not be adopted, but I do claim it on the ground that I have not sufficient knowledge, and this motion is to refer for the committee to furnish this sufficient knowledge, and I want to get some knowledge of why this is done. I stated that when I was on the floor debating the proposition, and I am still stating here that I am in the dark, and I believe by referring this back to the committee that they possibly would consent to furnish a little information along with their proposed suggestions, and that the real czar of this convention would then tell us how it would apply after we got the information. Now, I am in the dark and I want light. A great number of you stated right here that I was in that situation, and I frankly admitted it, and now here is a proposition to enlighten me and a good many others of my mind, to show us why we should consent to this proposed change in the present constitution. I heard, and I listened closely and attentively to every brother who took this floor and the members of the committee in particular, including the czar—

A DELEGATE: Mr. Chairman, a point of order—

DEL. McMULLEN (Continuing):—and, bless my soul, I don't know why at this time they should want to enact this legislation. To my mind, I believe it has got the key note of the whole entire situation. I want to say that I honestly believe that if this convention adjourned, that entire Committee on Constitution could enact every needed bit of legislation that the workers in the whole entire world need. I believe that they have all the necessary brains to do it.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Delegate McMullen—

DEL. McMULLEN: And I want to get it back there to the a so that they will give us a little light, all the light there is. I cannot talk on the resolution, but I am trying to talk—

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: You will please talk on the motion to refer.

DEL. McMULLEN: That is what I am talking on. That is why, I want it referred, for light. I want this practical wisdom—this bunch who have all the knowledge—to tell us why it is necessary. I want when they come back the next time that they will tell us the necessary reasons that caused them to propose this legislation. That is what I want to get at. That is why I am so hopeful. Sincerely and conscientiously, gentlemen, I am satisfied that you have all this knowledge secreted about you somewhere; in no visible place, but somewhere; you have got it somewhere, you know; this thing that we all appeal to as the spirit; this thing that tells us what is past and what is running things now. Bring out the spirit. I know we have had a skeleton all the while, a skeleton form of proposition. Now, get that spirit out. I

know there are some good spirits in Chicago. This Executive Board has dealt in those spirits, that I have heard of.

DEL. HAVER: A point of information.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The convention will have to come to order. The brother rose to a point of order.

DEL. HAVER: I did not rise to a point of order. I merely asked for a point of information.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: All right.

DEL. HAVER: What I wanted to know was the motion before the house, so that we will talk on this motion that is before the house. That is what I wanted to know.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: You should talk on the motion to refer back to the committee.

DEL. HAVER: I would really like to know what motion is before the house, because there have been so many different amendments and motions made that I can't understand what we are up against now.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The original motion before the house was to adopt or concur in the recommendations of the committee, and a motion was made to refer back to the committee for some changes; I forget just what the changes were that the delegate embodied in it.

DEL. KLEESE: A point of information. Brother McMullen referred to the czar. Now, I was busy writing, and I didn't know that either John D. Rockefeller or Henry H. Rogers was in here. If so, I would like to meet them.

DEL. McMULLEN: No, but Daniel De Leon is.

DEL. DUNCAN: I move you, as an amendment for the whole, that we concur in the recommendation of the committee on this head, with the proviso that they be instructed to provide for the formation of a general Executive Board of at least forty members, of which there shall be a local quorum at Chicago.

DEL. McKINNON: A point of order. My point of order is, this: The constitution reads that there shall be a general president, and it is understood that this constitution cannot be changed without a referendum vote. My point of order is this: Can the Chair legally recognize a motion to abolish the office of president? And can the Chair legally entertain an appeal from the decision of the Chair? I state that point of order.

DEL. McMULLEN: It upsets the constitution.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The Chair ruled on that point of order once. The Chair's ruling was that the contention was not right nor correct and that the Chair did not recognize any of those amendments as becoming law or the organic law of the organization until after being submitted to referendum vote of the rank and file of the Industrial Workers of the World.

DEL. McKINNON: Then this whole thing is out of order and it has no right before this convention.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: I would like to state to the brother, if he is making his point of order on that contention, that he is wrong. I believe this convention has got a right to submit any amendments to the constitution which they see fit and submit them to a referendum vote. But I hold that they have no right to amend one section of the constitution and immediately make it an organic law of the organization.

DEL. McKINNON: If it is the intention to refer this to a referendum vote, why not make that in the beginning? We will frame out those plans, and when we get to the end of it we will have the convention adopt them to take effect immediately, as these so-called revolutionists claim they are going to do.



DEL. AUGUSTINE: Mr. Chairman—

DEL. MARKLEY: I don't think the delegate on his feet need have any fear.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: You took the floor on a point of order. The Chair gave his ruling on your point of order, and this delegate over here has got the floor.

DEL. AUGUSTINE: I just want to ask a question.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Then this delegate has got the floor (indicating Del. Markley).

DEL. MARKLEY: There is no need of the delegate over here having such apprehension, because he can get out an injunction against us if he wants to stop us from doing any mischief.

DEL. DUNCAN: Mr. President, I made a motion a while ago as a substitute.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: I did not hear any second to the motion when you made it. The mover of the motion suggested that his motion be put, and it was seconded.

DEL. DUNCAN: Put my substitute.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Is there a second to the substitute?

A DELEGATE: I second that motion.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Repeat your substitute.

DEL. DUNCAN: The substitute motion I made was that this recommendation of the Constitution Committee be concurred in, with a proviso that they provide for the formation of a general Executive Board of at least forty members, a local quorum of which shall meet at Chicago.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: You have heard the substitute as stated.

A DELEGATE: A point of order. There has been a motion before this house and an amendment has been made, and this should be in the form of an amendment to the amendment, because there was no amendment to the amendment before the house. Therefore the substitute is an amendment to the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: It is a privileged motion which cannot be amended.

DEL. FOX: I rise to a point of order. A motion to refer is a privileged motion, and a substitute cannot take its place. The motion to refer is still before the house.

A DELEGATE: Correct.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: I believe the contention of the delegate (Fox) is correct. A motion to refer is a privileged motion and cannot be amended. A substitute motion takes different forms in parliamentary law. But the Chair will rule at this time that the substitute motion is out of order until such time as the question to refer has been settled.

DEL. DUNCAN: Then, since your ruling has been made and no motion or substitute or amendment either is in order, I would suggest to the committee, provided the motion to refer is carried, that they strike out of this clause of the constitution all the words after "general Executive Board," because all those words after "General Executive Board" provide for the composition of that General Executive Board, and hence there has been much confusion and misunderstanding and opposition. I will make that suggestion to the Constitution Committee. (Question called for.)

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The question has been called for.

DEL. DE LEON: As the mover of the original motion—

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: You are not the mover of the motion to refer. The motion to refer is the property of the house at this time.

DEL. DE LEON: Will the Chair allow a point of order?

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: I will allow you to discuss the motion to refer, exactly.

DEL. DE LEON: I make a point of order. My point of order is this: There is a motion before the house to concur. Upon that a motion is made to refer, giving reasons. Now, I want to give reasons why that motion to refer is not proper and why that motion to refer should not prevail. It is impossible to show that without I show the correctness of the motion before the house. So that it is impossible—my point of order is—to talk to the motion to refer, up and down and say no and yes and all that you could say, unless you consider the merits of the original motion and the motion that is to refer. I make that point, Mr. Chairman, and I therefore speak, of course, to the motion to refer, but I have to consider the original motion, and as the mover of the original motion, under the rule I take the floor with the consent of the Chair.

The motion to refer is premature. It could always have been made, even after we had taken a vote upon the subject, because then the mover of the motion would have seen that we made provision for what I vaguely surmise he has in mind. I have not been able to get an exact knowledge of what he means, because he used the words "administrative" and "executive" rather vaguely. Now, in order to show you that this motion to refer should be voted down I want to say—simultaneously answering Delegate Dumas, who asked, "Is the G. E. B. to consist of only three men?"—no. Delegate Dumas, who asked that question, is not posted because he was not here at last year's convention when you were confronted by a similar situation, and anybody else who was not at that convention is not posted except he knows what happened there. At last year's convention, after having adopted that clause as it stood there, that the G. E. B. shall consist of the President, the Secretary-Treasurer and one member from each of the thirteen departments, the Committee on Constitution brought in a recommendation that whereas there were not any more than three prospective departments, and whereas the G. E. B. should be a larger body than a body of three men, therefore it suggested the election of a certain number of members from the convention as members at large on the G. E. B., and the Committee on Constitution has a resolution which will follow immediately after the motion prevails, if it prevails, so recommending to this house, that the G. E. B. shall consist of eight members. That answers that part.

Now, then, Del. Parks—and this is an additional reason why the motion to refer should not prevail—Del. Parks made the point that if we have no president and the capitalist class swoops down and grabs our G. E. B. and puts them in jail, where are we? Somebody answers, "They are in jail." Does Del. Parks imagine that it is harder to put in one man as president than it is to put in eight men? Under the present system the decapitation of the organization is possible. If you recognize that the organization needs a president, then you recognize that it is all head, and consequently if the capitalists grab that head we are headless. Whereas, if we do not have such a thing, if we say the G. E. B. is the head, that G. E. B. is a harder thing to grab simultaneously than a president would be to grab.

Another reason why the motion to refer should not prevail is the falsity of the arguments of Del. McMullen. He said he had never heard any charge against the integrity of Sherman, and he said it with all the intonation of which he is so much a master. He never heard that remark from me. He never heard a single charge against the in-

tegrity of Sherman. I don't know why he didn't say that we never charged Sherman with having killed Del. McMullen's grandson. We never made any such charges. It is not necessary. I stated when I moved to concur that the reason was that the president fills today only one role, and that is the role of a general organizer, and that to give him the title of president besides is to give him wages and expenses to match. I stated that distinctly, and that is the reason upon which the committee proposes the abolition of the president.

Another reason why this motion to refer should not prevail is the claim made by our present incumbent in the chair, Mahoney, with regard to what Moyer said. Now, I am going to quote Haywood. I have no respect for the sentiment drag, and I hesitate to mention Haywood but as Moyer with his clanking chains on his limbs has been dragged before us, allow me also to drag before you Haywood.

DEL. MAHONEY: I rise to a point of personal privilege, as I am brought into this. My statement was in answer to a delegate who had brought in the names—

DEL. DE LEON: Excuse me.

DEL. MAHONEY (continuing):—of Moyer and Heywood before this convention as supporting his contention.

DEL. DE LEON: All right. The Chair has, of course, an advantage. He can rise to a personal privilege when one makes an allusion that is not insulting, whereas, when a delegate calls a delegate a "coward" the Chair takes no notice of it. However, those that were in the convention last year will remember Haywood in the chair. When our Committee on Constitution reported, Haywood's burly form covered the chair, and he said, "I object to this system because it makes the president the chief guy," and that his conception was a universal organization run by the masses.

Right here again is a reason why this motion to refer should not prevail. I wish to say that I am in a position that I might as well explain here. I hold, with respect to president or no president, very much as Daniel Webster held with respect to masons or no masons. You remember that in his days there was a great question about anti-masonry. He said that nothing was more ridiculous, in his mind, than masonry, unless it was anti-masonry. Now, I hold that there is nothing more ridiculous than voting for a president unless it be to vote against a president. I hold that after all, whether we elect a man as president and give him that halo and that title or not will make little difference, there will be a head; and a G. E. B. that holds that it will take three hundred years to develop or accomplish this thing, a G. E. B. that will go upon the policy that the present G. E. B. has gone on as a whole—that G. E. B., I don't care what president you put there, that G. E. B. is going to be the president. Nevertheless, although two ways may be provided to remove a president, I have been converted from my position, namely, the position I held at last year's Constitution Committee, where I said, as I said now, it makes no difference, if the majority want a president, I say president, so as to have free discussion; if the majority wants no president I am willing. But we have a president, and a concrete positive argument has been presented against him, an argument that I heard and you, although Del. McMullen did not hear it. It is that he is too costly an article; it is that he performs no function except the functions of a general organizer, and that being the case, joined to my knowledge that the complexion of the G. E. B. is what determines the presidency, the character or policy, and seeing this argument of the expensiveness of a president, I was in favor and I am now of removing him. Haywood held that view. You will find it in—

DEL. McMULLEN: Mr. Chairman, a question of information.

DEL. DE LEON: Excuse me, I refuse to give information while I am speaking.

DEL. McMULLEN: I am not asking you.

DEL. DE LEON: I have the floor.

DEL. McMULLEN: I want to know how long he will talk. He has talked twelve minutes now.

DEL. DE LEON: No.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: No, he has talked ten minutes.

DEL. McMULLEN: If he has talked ten minutes, all right.

DEL. DE LEON: I have the closing argument.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Delegate DeLeon, you don't mean to tell me that you have the closing argument on referring, do you?

DEL. DE LEON: I have the closing argument on my motion, which I understand to be before the house.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: But you cannot close the argument on referring. If the mover of the motion to refer wishes to close the argument, he certainly may close the argument.

DEL. DE LEON: Does he wish to close the argument? He says no.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Well, that does not concede the right to you to close.

DEL. DE LEON: Well, I understand.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Then the Chair will rule that your time that you are allowed has been taken. I take it you were entitled to ten minutes on account of you being the introducer of the amendment and leading the debate on that amendment, and the rule states that such person shall have ten minutes.

DEL. DE LEON: The rule does not define the time. It says such person shall close the debate.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: It says that such person shall have ten minutes to speak on the question, and that the mover of the question shall have the right to close the debate.

DEL. DE LEON: All right.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: I hold that I am ruling fair with you, and that is my ruling.

DEL. DE LEON: I want to say that I accept the ruling. I have spoken on the original motion, but I rose to the motion to refer.

DEL. PARKS: I rise to a question of personal privilege. I have not talked on the question of president or no president; I talked on the General Executive Board as provided for. Personally I am not in favor of having a general president, and I shall vote against having the office of general president.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Are you ready for the question? (Question called for.) If so, the vote occurs on the motion to refer back to the committee. The secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called as far as the name of Delegate Schulz.

DEL. McMULLEN: Did I understand that Brother Maichele had 36 votes?

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Yes.

DEL. McMULLEN: You ruled this man (McCabe) was out, and he must be out, too.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: No.

DEL. McMULLEN: Yes, if you disqualify one you disqualify all.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Tullar, one.

DEL. TULLAR: I vote no.

DEL. McMULLEN: What is the ruling? Does he vote or not?

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The Chair was going to instruct the sec-

retary to call Kirkpatrick's name when he got through. I didn't know as the convention had put him out.

DEL. KIRKPATRICK: He called my name and I registered my vote as yes.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The convention decided by a vote that you were no longer a member of this convention, Brother McCabe, and the president when the secretary got through was going to instruct him to call the name of Kirkpatrick, as the vote did not apply to you, I understand, according to the argument.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Kirkpatrick, yes.

The roll call was completed.

DEL. SHENKAN: A point of information. When the vote was taken on the unseating of McCabe and Kirkpatrick, didn't they vote to unseat them from the convention? Have they got any longer any vote?

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: My contention was that if it applied to one it applied to all. My contention was overruled, so there has been no action taken on Kirkpatrick. That is the ruling of the Chair.

The vote was announced as follows: Total vote, 627½; yes, 260½; no, 367.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The motion to refer is lost and the motion to concur in the recommendations of the committee is before you.

DEL. SIMS: I move the previous question. (Seconded.)

DEL. CRONIN: I rise for the purpose of finding out what we are concurring in.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The secretary of the committee will read the report again, or that portion of it.

Delegate Kinneally, of the committee, read the section of the old constitution and then the section as amended by the committee.

DEL. PARKS: Mr. Chairman—

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Delegate Cronin, did you rise to the floor again?

DEL. CRONIN: No, Mr. Chairman, I understand this is not debatable, a vote has been taken to refer, the previous question has been moved and it is not debatable.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: A motion to refer does not cut off debate.

DEL. SIMS: Mr. Chairman, I moved the previous question.

DEL. KLEESE: I seconded it.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Delegate Cronin has got the floor. He was speaking when the previous question was moved.

DEL. CRONIN: I want to say that I am opposed to this proposed amendment to the constitution. I am opposed to some of the acts that have been committed by this convention. I see no material difference in changing these officers. You simply cut out the word "President" and insert "Assistant Secretary," as near as I can understand according to this amendment. It makes no difference only in the name; not in the personnel. The organization will be officered the same. I am opposed to the tactics that have been used here in connection with the entire matter by the grand learned Rabbi, who in his first introduction of the amendments to the constitution said upon the floor of this convention stated that this constitution would not become the law until it was adopted as a whole. I am making this point to show the unfairness of the delegates who have participated in the attempt to change this constitution. After it had been agreed that we would proceed with the adoption of the constitution seriatim as submitted by the committee, the gentleman rose and made a point of order and appealed

from the decision of the Chair and said that the constitution was now in force. I presume the next dirty tactics will be, in the event this is carried, to claim that the president of the organization is no longer a delegate to the convention. Any way, I hold that if we proceed along those lines I won't be a party to it. I represent living men with votes, and if any of those tactics are followed I have to answer to them. You men that are following those tactics have no one but your leader, and will have to answer to no one because you don't represent anybody. I could show you, and if I had permission I would show you the tactics that have been raised.

DEL. DE LEON: A point of order.

DEL. CRONIN: I know you can't stand it. You will use your Mud Hill tactics on me next week.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: State your point of order.

DEL. DE LEON: My point of order is that the gentleman is not speaking to the question.

DEL. CRONIN: What is the point of order?

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The point of order was that you were not speaking to the motion. I took it that Del. Cronin was asking a question as to whether this, if carried, takes the same position that the preceding one did.

DEL. CRONIN: That is exactly my contention, to find out if they were going to continue in this manner; if so, we might as well know it now. I want to know if the following of one political organization is going to run us all, and if we have got to follow, we might as well know it now. If you are going to discharge everybody we want to know it, and we want to beat you with resignations. I do for one. So that if any one will answer that question, all right; I don't want to discuss it.

DEL. McKINNON: As was stated, the cause for abolishing the office of president is the fact that there is not men enough in this convention, or not a man in this convention strong enough to assume the responsibility of that office. As I understand it, the plan outlined is to elect men from the floor of this convention as an Executive Board. Now, if there is not a man on the floor of this convention strong enough to be president, how are you going to find men strong enough to form a good Executive Board? In case you do, I would suggest that you put the man, the brother here who conducted the strike in Pittsburgh, on the Executive Board.

DEL. FOOTE: A point of order. As a member of the Constitution Committee. I wish to state my reason for voting against the office of president was as Delegate McKinnon has stated.

DEL. KLEESE: Brother Chairman and Fellow Workers, I voted with Comrade De Leon several times during this convention, and I want to state that I would much rather vote with a man who understands the revolutionary movement of the working class than to vote with any business agent.

DEL. McKINNON: A point of order.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: State your point of order.

DEL. McKINNON: My point of order is that we are not here as revolutionists. We are here as industrial unionists.

(Shouts of derision, and "No" and "Sit down" and hisses.)

DEL. McKINNON: There is no revolution about this at all.

A DELEGATE: Get an injunction.

DEL. McKINNON: My point remains that we are not here as revolutionists. We are here as industrial unionists, and I contend that that word "revolution" should not be on the records of this meeting

or this convention. (Derisive laughter, and a voice, "Apologize.") I want a ruling on that point.

DEL. KLESSE: Brother Chairman, do you sustain that injunction?

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: If you want a ruling as to what this convention is, I will give you a ruling. It is supposed to be a convention of the Industrial Workers of the World.

DEL. MCKINNON: My point is that the word "revolution" is not to be used.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The Chair won't rule on that. (Laughter.)

A DELEGATE: Get out an injunction.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Delegates, please preserve order.

DEL. KLEESE: I see the Chair refuses to rule on the injunction. That is a pretty good idea. But what I want to be understood here is that the revolutionary movement of the working class does not need any leader. We do not need any man to look up our jobs and collect our dues and subtract a rebate, or snug up his coat collar around his dear little ears and stand on a street corner in a chilly city in the West. What we need is men who have something of the courage of their convictions.

DEL. CRONIN: Does that refer to me?

DEL. KLEESE: Now, Sun-cured, be quiet. I have the floor now.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Do you rise to a point of order?

DEL. CRONIN: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Then address the Chair.

DEL. CRONIN: I asked, was he addressing his conversation to me? He was telling about me.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The Chair would rule you are out of order. They are talking about the president.

DEL. CRONIN: They are talking about whom?

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: They are talking about the president.

DEL. CRONIN: If he speaks about me I want him to be right. I don't want him to make any mistake.

DEL. KLEESE: Well, Brothers, I don't want to say very much more. I see that the shoe pinches. Now I was not talking to the president or about the president. I was talking about our friend, Sun-cured. The point that I want to bring out is this, and I want every reactionist and copper-collar man to understand, that the revolutionary movement in this convention does not need any leader. There is no copper-collared king among the revolutionists. We do not need a collar with "Job" on it.

A DELEGATE: I move the previous question. (Seconded.)

DEL. McMULLEN: I rise to a question of personal privilege.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The previous question has been called for. What is your question of personal privilege?

DEL. McMULLEN: My question of personal privilege, Sir, is that no delegate can rise on this floor and fling an epithet in the teeth of anybody, unless he is qualified to state who he means. If a man can stand on this floor and make a statement without one solitary single word to substantiate his allegations, he places himself in the position of a man who tells a deliberate falsehood.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The previous question has been called for. If there is no objection on the part of any delegate to voting for the previous question, it will be so recorded.

DEL. FRENCH: I do not desire to object to putting the previous question, but I do desire to put myself on record in this way: I think the very brother who has just stopped speaking, McMullen, referred to some delegates who had been voting contrary to the way he

has been voting, as following a leader believing in political action. Now, I am casting four votes here for an organization, the active members of which are men absolutely opposed to political action. They are so-called anarchists. They sent me here to vote the way they feel, and I for one am casting no vote for following any political leader. I am casting it because when I consider a question is correct I vote for it, and I don't care for any political leader or anybody else. I do not come here as attached to any political party. I come to represent the sentiment of the men who sent me here, and those men are not attached to any political party. Some of them have political attachments; the the most active members of the largest vote I cast are men opposed to political action, but they recognize that the principles for which I have been voting are the thing. That is why I resent any imputation of that kind from any man, whether he has a copper collar around his neck or what else.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The previous question has been moved. The question now is, Shall the previous question be put? Is there any delegate on the floor who objects?

DEL. KIRKPATRICK: I would like to have a point of information. I may have misunderstood. I would like, through the Chair, to ask Bro. Maichele if he said he represented a local from Schenectady or represented a department of the Metal Workers' Union.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The Chair would rule you out of order. The previous question has been called for. Is there any delegate who objects to the previous question being put without the roll call? If not, the vote will occur on the motion to concur in the report of the committee in amending Section 1, Article II. The Secretary will proceed to call the roll.

The roll was called as far as the first five names.

DEL. AHERN: I do not know what I am voting on.

DEL. CRONIN: Is it the previous question or the amendment to the constitution?

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: It is the amendment to the constitution that you are voting on now.

DEL. CRONIN: The boys were of the opinion that it was the previous question.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: I asked if there were any objections on the part of any delegate to having the vote on "Shall the previous question be put?" It carried. There was no objection. Do you understand the question over there?

A DELEGATE: No, I don't.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Let it be understood now that the motion before you now is the concurring in the report of your Constitution Committee in its amendment to Section 1 of Article II as to the officers of the organization. The Secretary will proceed to call the roll.

The roll was begun again and completed, and the vote stood: Total vote, 607½; Yes, 354½; No, 253.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The motion is carried, and you concur in the report of your committee.

#### AUDITING COMMITTEE.

DEL. FOX: The Committee on Auditing would rise to a question of privilege just now. It is but a few minutes before adjourning. You adjourn at 6 o'clock and you can hardly consider another constitutional point. We have an important matter that we would like to bring before you, and get instructions.



THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Is there any objection on the part of any delegate to their asking for instructions? If not, the delegate will proceed.

# REPORT.

Delegate Fox, the Chairman of the Auditing Committee, then presented the following report:  
To the Members of the Convention:

The Auditing Committee met at 7:30 P. M., Sept. 26, organizing with Wm. R. Fox as Chairman and B. Stone as Secretary. The office at headquarters being locked and no material to work on in the reach of the Committee, it adjourned till 9 A. M., Sept. 27, when it reconvened promptly at the hour named.

Then the Committee glanced over the general headings of the statement of the expert accountants engaged by the General Executive Board. We were told it took two experienced accountants nine or ten days to compile this statement, which deals with the accounts up to August 22, 1906. This statement of the American Accounting Company deals simply with book and bank accounts and cash balances wherever found. We have no reason to doubt that it reveals our financial income and outlay as shown by the office records and the testimony of the bank balances.

But the statement of the American Accounting Company is limited by this clause: "Providing all vouchers to be authentic." That is to say, these expert bookkeepers accept the accounts as they were found. They do not pass on the exactness of the official record. They do not determine the justification of any outlay. That was not a part of their business. They simply declare, if these books and other records contain correct data, the balance is thus and thus.

Now, the Committee believes the experts have done all that can be done toward untangling the accounts. The Committee would have to deal with the same records and could hope to do no better, if as well. There is, however, one thing not done that we could attempt to do: that is to inquire the reason of the outlays, and to try to discover if in each case the expenditure was justified. Any other interesting matter that might develop during our examination could be made the subject of report.

We come before the convention at this time to be instructed as to the scope of the investigation you desire us to assume. If you command us to go over the ground already covered by the expert accountants, you give us a month's work. If we are merely to try to determine if your money has been expended in a wise and honest way, we might get done before the close of the convention.

Respectfully submitted,

WM. R. FOX, Chairman.

EMANUEL HAUCK.

E. R. MARKLEY.

B. STONE, Secretary.

DEL. McKINNON: I move that we adjourn till 9 o'clock tomorrow morning. (Seconded.)

DEL. FOX: Wait; let us have this privileged question settled. This committee can't work unless you instruct it, as we say if you want us to cover the ground already covered by the expert accountants, that is, to practically do the same thing they have done, then we will have to be here probably a month after the convention adjourns, and you will have to make some provision for keeping us here. But if you simply ask us to examine the reasons for the outlays and to report to you

whether in our opinion these outlays were justified or not, then we can probably do that before you close this convention.

DEL. SIMS: I move that the request of the committee be granted.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: I recognize this delegate over here that had the floor (McKinnon).

DEL. SHENKAN: I make a motion to the effect that the committee be instructed to investigate the merits of the expenditures. I have no doubt whatsoever but what the accounts have been correctly added and subtracted. The experts go over these accounts, and being experts, as they should be, their accounts are mathematically correct. There is no question but what, so far as addition and subtraction are concerned, their accounts are correct. But here are certain expenditures made and money expended, and this is a question we want to determine as to certain vouchers. For that reason I would suggest or make a motion to that effect, that the committee be instructed to look up the vouchers as they themselves have suggested. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: It has been regularly moved and supported that the Auditing Committee be instructed to bring in a report on the expenditure of the money paid out.

DEL. FOX: On the merits.

DEL. AUGUSTINE: Is it not a fact that we have a financial report in printed form, and is it not further a fact that all expenditures and receipts have been enumerated in that report? If any one has any objections to the way the money has been expended or received they could raise that objection.

DEL. LINGENFELTER: I move the previous question.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Do you want a roll call?

DEL. McINTOSH: No, we don't want one.

DEL. LINGENFELTER: No.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Then you had better not move the previous question.

DEL. McINTOSH: There is no objection.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The motion now is that the Auditing Committee be instructed to bring in their report on the expenditure of the money of this organization, whether justly expended or unjustly. Is there any delegate who objects to be recorded as voting in favor of this motion? If not, the motion will be declared carried. Hearing none, it is so ordered.

On motion of Del. McKinnon, seconded by Del. McMullen, the convention adjourned till 9 o'clock, Friday, Sept. 28.

## TWELFTH DAY.

### FRIDAY, SEPT. 28.—MORNING SESSION.

President Sherman called the convention to order at 9 o'clock.

The roll of members was called by the Secretary.

DEL. SCHOMBERG: Is the convention open for business?

THE CHAIRMAN: The first is the reading of the resolutions.

DEL. SCHOMBERG: I make a motion, Mr. Chairman, that all the amendments and the election of officers be submitted to a referendum vote of all the members that are in good standing at this time. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been regularly moved and seconded that amendments to this constitution be submitted to a referendum. Are you ready for the question?

DEL. HANNEMAN: I move to make an amendment—

DEL. DE LEON: I rise to a point of order.

THE CHAIRMAN: State your point of order.

DEL. DE LEON: My point of order is that we are working under the rules, and that under the rules the Committee on Constitution has the floor; having had the floor yesterday when we adjourned the Committee on Constitution has the floor now; that this motion does not come from the Committee on Constitution; that it is an ex-parte motion and consequently cannot be entertained until the rules are first suspended. To condense my point of order, the Committee on Constitution has the floor and can not be taken from the floor except by special motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: It cannot be what?

DEL. DE LEON: Can not be taken from the floor and somebody else get the floor except by a special motion to suspend the rules.

THE CHAIRMAN: I believe the point of order is well taken at this time.

DEL. SCHOMBERG: I move that we suspend the report of the committee until we know whether we are going to have a referendum vote or not. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been regularly moved and seconded that we suspend the rules and decide whether we are going to have a referendum vote or not. Are you ready for the question?

DEL. FOX: I object to the last part of the motion. The motion was only to suspend the rules. Whatever they are going to take up, that they can take up afterwards.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does the mover of that motion desire to modify the motion so as to make it in harmony with the brother's objection? The brother objects to your attaching anything to your motion only that we are to suspend the rules at this time. Do you want to modify that?

DEL. SCHOMBERG: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded that we suspend the rules at this time. Are you ready for the question? (Question called for.)

The roll was called, resulting: Total vote, 528; Yes, 160; No, 368.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is lost, and the Constitution Committee will proceed to report.

#### ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN.

DEL. DE LEON: I rise to make a subsidiary motion, a motion that has precedence over it. My motion is that this convention now proceed to elect its chairman. My reason for that motion is that under the constitution, obedient to it and every clause in it, the presidency has been abrogated. The constitution provides that the president shall be the chairman of the convention. The president having been abrogated, there is no chairman of this convention. You can only consider the present occupant of the chair as a temporary occupant. My motion is that this convention—

DEL. MULLADY: A point of order. My point of order, or point of information at least, is whether this motion of this brother is in order or not.

DEL. DE LEON: It is a subsidiary motion. We must have a chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: I believe it is. Will you take the chair, Bro. Mahoney?

Del. Mahoney took the chair.

DEL. DE LEON: If this motion is before the house I wish to speak on it.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: State your motion before the house.

DEL. DE LEON: Shall I state the motion?

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Yes.

DEL. DE LEON: My motion is that this house, this convention, now proceed to elect its chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Do I hear a second to the motion?

DEL. FOX: I second the motion.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: It has been regularly moved and supported that this house now proceed to elect a chairman, and the chair rules the motion out of order.

DEL. DE LEON: I appeal from the decision of the chair. (Seconded). Now, gentlemen, this whole question hinges upon the subject of the referendum. I yield to none in reverence to the great principle of the referendum, and for that reason I shall resist with might and main any attempt to make the referendum inadequate and to turn its edge against itself. The referendum is the child of the civilization of our generation. It consequently has been born enwrapped with the experience of our generation. Among the experiences that unite and that govern in this matter of the referendum there are two great principles, and I ask your careful attention to the presentation of them. One principle is that the referendum must be a concrete proposition, upon the general principle of experience that a variety of propositions submitted to masses widely dispersed can not be intelligently handled by them collectively. Since they do not see each other or one another, since they cannot make an amendment to the amendment, the result will be that upon a referendum of a great variety of subjects one thing might prevail in one place, another in another, and finally when all the things that have prevailed are put together you have a crazy-quilt that will not hold. That first principle of the referendum is that it must be a concrete proposition. For instance, "Shall we annex Cuba?" Not a great many laws as how to annex it, but the concrete proposition, "Shall we annex it?" "Shall we have war with China?" "Shall we have Chinese immigration?" All concrete propositions. That is one great principle of the referendum, and I ask you to remember that, because I shall come back to it with the constitution and show you that the constitution so maintains.

The next great principle of the referendum, the next great principle of experience under which the referendum is born, is this: That whatever is expressed in a document excludes thereby all other things not so expressed; if a certain document names a certain thing, the naming of that certain thing excludes all others that it does not name. I do not mean to suggest erudition, but I want to go on record through the stenographic report, and through that I shall quote a maxim which in the Latin tongue has come down through our jurisprudence. It is: "Expressio unius est exclusio alterius." If you express in a document a certain thing, if you name a certain thing under a certain head, you thereby exclude all others. Now I am going to show you that this constitution has been gotten up by the light of that principle. I was myself on that committee, and it is only by a violation of that principle by the ridiculous interpretation that is attempted here that you can have a referendum vote on this matter. Section 1 of Article II, on page 6, provides as follows: "The General President and the General Secretary-Treasurer shall be nominated from the floor of the convention, and the three candidates for each respective office receiving the largest number of votes in the convention shall be submitted to the general membership of the organization for election." You have here an express statement of the subject that is to be submitted by referendum. Do we find any enumeration demanding a referendum vote in other cases? Not at all. It states there that those officers are to be submitted to a referendum. They being three, all the three are to be

submitted, the idea being that the general officers shall not be subject to election by the convention, that the general officers shall be subject to a general vote. The constitution therefore expressly provided for the referendum in the matter of the election of the general officers, what we may call national officers. Does it contain any expression, any such command, with regard to any other clause? You will look for it in vain. If the idea was to have the referendum for all, if the contention is made here that the referendum is binding before all things, then that clause there is superfluous, the one I just read. Then all that would have been done would be to put in a clause that the whole constitution and all the officers should go to a referendum. The very fact, however, of the constitution specifying what shall go to a referendum and leaving all other matters not so specified, makes it clear that the other matters are not going to a referendum, ipso facto, or as a matter of course.

As to the second principle, I invite your attention to page 11, that is, the third paragraph on that page. An attempt has been made to prove that the Committee on Constitution considers this convention not to have fit material. If I thought so I would have picked up my grip and gone home. Now, I must ask you to do careful thinking. I read: "The General Executive Board shall have full power to conduct the affairs of the organization between conventions, and their decision on all matters pertaining to the organization of any subordinate part thereof shall be binding, subject to an appeal to the" —what? To the referendum? No, sir. "Subject to an appeal to the convention or" —now, listen—"or to the entire membership of the organization; provided, that in case a referendum vote of the membership is demanded by any subordinate or sub-department," then it will take such and such course. In other words, on page 11 we have an express provision that supplements that first specification as to what shall be referred. That section that I just read indicates that the convention is the law-making power, that what the convention does is the law of the I. W. W., with two exceptions: one as to the general officers, that must stand for a referendum, and the other exception is when a department or any subdivision of the body demands a referendum. In other words, the constitution is specific upon the subject that unless a referendum vote is demanded no referendum is had. The constitution not only specifically provides for what shall be referred absolutely, but it provides for the wise, the civilized principle of the referendum in a civilized way. By stating how the referendum shall be had and under what circumstances, it specifically and clearly makes the point that if the referendum is to be had upon any other subject it must be had upon the demand of a department of the rank and file; not as an initial act, because as an initial act what are you going to refer? An initial act? No, we shall refer that which the rank and file demands.

Upon these two principles I contend that to maintain that we must send a thing to the referendum or must send these clauses to the referendum as a matter of duty is absolutely denied by the constitution, which expressly provides how the referendum shall be had and that it must come through a demand from the rank and file. Secondly, I contend that to hold that this must be sent absolutely to a referendum is making a caricature of the referendum by submitting anything and everything; whereas that clause is in line with the principle of experience of civilized man, that you can refer and act intelligently on the referendum only upon a specific thing, and if the rank and file demands the referendum none shall go further or quicker than I towards helping them in every respect. But one thing is to have a referendum that civilization has shown should be had; one thing is to have a referen-

dum which the constitution expressly provides for; and another thing is to propose a referendum that is not a referendum and propose it as a matter of duty when the constitution expressly shows that it is not; to propose it as a matter of fairness, when instead of its being fair it is the unfairer thing, because we thereby nullify the principle that appears in this clause which recognizes the fact that you can not refer anything and everything simultaneously to anybody and everybody.

My closing point with regard to this point of order is this: Our organization, our constitution, was born in the throes of travail of last year's convention. It was born as we all are born, covered all over with dirt and slime and putrefaction. We have divided ourselves in this convention into two camps, both considering themselves constitutionalists. For the sake of the argument I shall concede that both are sincere, and I do believe that both are. There is this difference between them: that one camp holds that what was born was the child, and that camp is trying to save that child and wipe it clean of the dirt and the slime and the blood with which it is covered. Whereas the other constitutionalists are trying to throw the child into the slop bucket, and are trying to save the dirt and the slime and the putrefaction with which that child was born.

That is the difference, and I think it is positively comical to see men who stand convicted before this convention of having trampled on the principles of this constitution by the deposition and imposition of officers—men who have refused the referendum, men who suspended locals because they did not submit to the men who lined up with those elements,—I think it is positively comical to have such elements come before this convention and bow down to the referendum and salaam and kotow to the rank and file, or start off screeching like howling dervishes, "Referendum!" No, away with such comedy! We are here, children of the twentieth century civilization. We do not propose to allow a great principle to be turned into a comical farce or to allow its edge to be turned against itself.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem (Del. Mahoney): The Chair, in ruling as he did, ruled so on the contention that he ruled yesterday. I feel that if there is an individual in this convention who should not sit on this floor, that this convention should be large enough, broad enough and big enough to deal with that individual without infringing on the constitutional rights of his constituency. I contend that in this case the constitution provides that the president when installed is the president of this organization, until his successor is elected and installed, and that that election shall be by a referendum vote. The constitution also makes provision for putting the president out of office in case he has violated the obligation and the oath of his office. I take it that if this convention takes the position of deposing the president, that this would be the mode of procedure, and not a disfranchisement of the rank and file of this organization on a referendum. I concur in what the delegate states here as to the referendum or the portion of the constitution that he claims provides for a referendum. But I feel that I am here representing a constituency that I am going to report to, and they will decide as to whether I was right or wrong, and I am sure that I will be satisfied with the decision whether it is against me or whether it is in support of my contention. The expressions of the delegates who installed the Western Federation of Miners as an integral part of the Industrial Workers of the World were that the entire work of that convention be submitted to a referendum of the rank and file. It was submitted in pamphlet form to the rank and file of the Mining Department. But after the constitution and the by-laws were placed in print there was no clause in their showing that they shall be sub-

mitted. I contend that the constituency that I represent demands that they shall be submitted, and their will is mine. Thus I make my ruling, and as I stated before, if the president of this organization has violated his obligation, there is a mode of procedure to put him out of the organization without first trampling on the constitutional rights of your constituency. I feel that my ruling is correct, and I feel that in case it is reversed by this convention they put their seal of approval on debauched legislation by refusing to submit it to a referendum vote. The question now before you is, Shall the decision of the chair stand? Those in favor of the decision of the chair will vote yes. Those in favor of the appellant will vote no. The secretary will call the roll.

DEL. McMULLEN: I want to know just what this question is.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The question is, at this time, that through the adoption of this amendment yesterday there is no longer a president of the Industrial Workers of the World, and that this convention now proceed to elect a chairman.

DEL. McMULLEN: I understand you ruled—

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: I ruled the motion out of order.

DEL. McMULLEN: There was a motion made to that effect, was there, and you ruled the motion out of order?

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Yes, I ruled the motion out of order on the contention I stated.

DEL. McMULLEN: And he appeals?

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The mover of the motion appealed from my decision.

DEL. McMULLEN: And now the proposition—

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The question is now, Shall the decision of the chair stand or not?

DEL. McMULLEN: Now, the question as I understand is this: If your decision does not stand the present incumbent in the office of president is deposed.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Yes, certainly.

DEL. PARKS: It is a revolution.

DEL. McMULLEN: All right; if you want a revolution, have it.

DEL. MOTHERWELL: I ask for information. I don't propose to keep out a lot of motions. If you want gag law take it yourselves. If we adopt the tactics that have been adopted here we are shutting out the referendum vote, as there is no more referendum and it is no more use, and let a few individuals in this convention run it.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The question before you is, Shall the decision of the chair stand? Those voting yes support the chair. Those voting no support the appellant. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, at the completion of which—

DEL. PARKS: Mr. Chairman, I want to raise a point of order here on the vote of Mr. Huelse. Mr. Huelse is not in the house and I don't see why he can vote three votes when he is not here.

DEL. O'DONNELL: I want to state that I represent Huelse with three votes, with the seal of the local. I handed you my credentials at an early session.

THE SECRETARY: They have not been read. There are two credentials here.

DEL. O'DONNELL: That is not my fault. I believe the credentials should have been presented long ago and given me a chance to vote the vote when I first sent it in.

DEL. PARKS: I maintain the vote ought not to be counted and he is not duly seated as an alternate.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Knock that out.

THE SECRETARY: The Secretary cannot do it without special orders from the house.

The vote on the appeal resulted: Total vote, 618; Yes, 276; No, 342.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The appellant is sustained. The motion now before the house is to proceed to elect a chairman. The secretary will call the roll.

DEL. McMULLEN: I believe that is a debatable question, is it not, before we proceed?

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: It is.

DEL. McMULLEN: Is there a limit on all this question of debate?

DEL. AUGUSTINE: Yes, ten minutes.

DEL. McMULLEN: Is there a limit on this question of debate?

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: I will concede to you the same length of time that Del. DeLeon had on this question.

DEL. McMULLEN: Well, Mr. President and brother delegates, I feel that this convention has brought things to a crisis. I feel that we who stood for the formation of this convention on the lines laid down in the constitution as it was adopted by the last convention have reached that point where we can safely go back to the men who sent us here and say that this convention has no regard for the constitution, and violates it with impunity whenever in its judgment it feels the necessity of carrying out a plan that they have outlined. It was formed unconstitutionally; it has been one continued protest against the constitution ever since it was formed, and it was only under that constitution that this convention was called and formed. Now then, when you fail to recognize that fact, when you destroy the bond that binds us together here, there is nothing to bind us further. This law which we are now about to wipe out says as plainly as it can by implication, by words, as plainly as anything can be said, that the president and the secretary-treasurer are in their offices until their successors are elected and qualified. It says further that that same election must be submitted to a referendum vote of the entire organization. You propose right here to oust one of these men and place in power some one else whom it will not be possible to take the referendum vote upon of the membership before he goes in the chair. Now, I want to say to you that when you do that I feel that I can go to the department that sent me here and say to them that this convention has disregarded the obligation that held us together, or in other words, the constitution. I feel that my presence here representing that department is at an end. There is no more need that the Department of Mining Industry be here. This effort to destroy the Industrial Workers of the World within this body has been greater, more effectual and has more completely done the work than Gompers, the Citizens' Alliance or organized capital in this country was ever able to do. They have done their work. When this is done, when these acts are consummated, there will be no I. W. W. left. I might say just as the president of this organization, the acting president right now in the chair, stated, that these clauses which we are passing upon now were passed upon by the Western Federation of Miners by a referendum vote. We considered, all of us in Denver considered in the last convention where I was elected, that the constitution of this organization was supreme, until it itself was amended in accordance with the terms of that constitution. It says distinctly, emphatically, as plainly as can be said, that the president must be elected as one of the three candidates receiving the largest vote upon nomination in this convention and the same submitted for referendum. Here you are sustaining an appeal against the Chairman in order to vote upon this matter and at once oust the present incumbent and put someone else in it. That is, you say, a necessity, as I



followed the argument of the gentleman who was appealing, showing distinctly, plainly and in every way, that it is not the intent, not the purpose to have a referendum vote upon the acts of this convention. You say that in every way. I tell you that the miners of the West say that no act of any convention can be law until they themselves have passed upon its merits and have enjoyed their right of a referendum vote upon the acts of their servants—not their masters, but their servants. I claim that I am here, that I have fulfilled my duty to them, that I have not in one single instance on this floor in any manner, shape or form done one single act but what they in their convention, and it duly submitted to their membership, have ratified by their approving votes. Men have laughed and sneered right here on this floor when I attempted to explain the conditions and circumstances here, and alleged that I did not represent the men who sent me here. I tell you I can show by the acts of the last convention wherein they proved, and I myself submitted to them, that there are no qualifications of any kind politically required for a man to be a member in good standing in this organization and retain the same. And you have scoffed and sneered at that idea, and the same people from whom it emanates pay two-thirds of the taxes by your own reports. And you sit here, gentlemen, coming from organizations of seven to ten members and sneer at us men who represent 1,000, 1,500 and 2,000 men, and you presume to say, without having gone and submitted that to them or they expressing their wishes and desires.

I say this is the crisis. You depose your Chairman there, and I tell you that we cannot stay here, and we will not. And I say this in no spirit of threat, no spirit of vindictiveness; plainly I tell you that I believe that you have torn asunder that common bond that we thought had bound us together. We thought that was a bond that would be supreme, and that you would recognize it too. But you say, "To hell with it; we want none of it. It is good enough if it suits our ideas, but to hell with it and we don't want it when it don't suit our ideas on this plan." Now, I say to you, tear this apart and there is nothing to keep us here. You have destroyed everything that it expresses as a common interest for us to remain here together. Now, I want to say this, and I want to say that it struck me with some force, that the ideals as expressed in the call for the first convention and the sentiments of the delegates who came there and which became a part of it were in a large sense to be considered as a controlling factor of thought and idea, and particularly of law as to what you would do. Now, I say, is this not a fair statement, that that call and the ideas and the personality of those men who came together to create this I. W. W.—I ask you if the law as they themselves made it in concrete form and placed it in the constitution is not a fair interpretation of what they wanted? If it was not, is it not fair to presume that they would have remained longer together and have formed something else? We say it was. We all over the West have tried to live up to it. We have lived up to it. We had a fight to do so, it is true. And I want to say to you this, that in the city of Butte there were questions where a majority of twenty men carried the entire proposition of whether the Western Federation of Miners in Montana would remain with the I. W. W., and you can see how close it was, and this was in a vote of 1,700 men. You can see just exactly what these things hinge on. Now, I want to tell you, brothers, and I say it in all sincerity, that you have taken the side of those who fought against the I. W. W. there, and you have succeeded where they failed. You have destroyed this bond. You depose the president of this organization without pursuing the course laid down in the constitution, of taking the three highest re-

ceiving the nomination and submitting them to a referendum vote for ratification. You do that thing, and I say we have nothing here to hold us. There is no call for us to remain. You have destroyed the fundamental work on which the first convention met and upon which they were all agreed.

Now, there is one other view, and it is an important view. We all know the argument about this Metal and Machinery Department. We all heard it. We watched both sides of it. We have got all those points on both sides, but this cannot be denied, that even though it was created upon the statement of the men as to sufficient membership for the purpose of making a department, there was time when they discovered what its actual membership was, and they found it down to about 840. The taxes paid at this time are now on a matter of over 3,000 men. Does not that show that the organization is growing? And doesn't it show that the constitution is bearing fruit and that it is bringing men and women together in this common federation? And yet you sit here and say: "We will suspend this section, we will destroy that section, whenever it suits the convenience of a majority of the revolutionists on this floor." This question passed a few moments ago with the voices of 100 men on a majority for the whole organization. I ask you, gentlemen, to stand by that constitution and vote this question down. I say to you that if you do not do so we cannot sit here. I say that the men in New York who represent the larger unions in New York, will go out here when we go. We cannot and will not stay at this time.

DEL. MOTHERWELL: I would like to know whom you refer to when you say "we."

DEL. McMULLEN: I have said all I want to.

DEL. MOTHERWELL: To whom are you referring when you say "we?" Do you mean all the delegates in the Western Federation of Miners or only a department? Is that what I understand?

DEL. McMULLEN: I mean those delegates who are actuated to support the constitution of the Industrial Workers of the World as it is written, as the Western Federation of Miners joined, supported and paid for. I mean those delegates that were actuated by that spirit, no matter who they are or what their names are.

DEL. HESLEWOOD: One word about the Western Federation of Miners and how they conduct themselves. I have been a member of the Western Federation of Miners for twelve years, and I never knew the officers yet to be elected by the referendum. For instance, such a thing was not discussed until Bro. Charles Mahoney was a party in the convention and he was elected on the floor of the convention. So that point is gone right here, that there is any such thing as the referendum vote for any officers of the Western Federation of Miners, of the Executive Board or national officers. That will settle that point.

So far as "we" pulling out, I don't know who he means by "we." If he means that the reactionists are going to leave this convention I hope to God they do, and I wish they had never come. This I. W. W. business, this Industrial form of organization, has been the ideal of over half the Western miners. It has been their ideal for the last twenty years, for the miners to have an industrial form of organization, based upon class-conscious lines. Now, I want to state that Bro. McMullen is not voicing the sentiment of the miners that I come from. As much as I believe in the referendum, I just want to say that the men that I come from are not reactionists. They are revolutionists who are revolting at all times against the capitalist system, and I maintain this, that there were few men in the Western Federation of Miners' convention that were not revolutionists; and yet right in the face of

that preamble they come to this convention—a preamble that is based on revolution—a preamble that is thoroughly revolutionary to the dot—there are men that come to this convention who do not believe that there is a class struggle between capital and labor. Now, much as I believe in the referendum, I do not believe a referendum vote is good at this time in this convention. I believe, as Bro. DeLeon said, that it is all right in cases, but in this case it is not a good thing because it is going to be like patriotism, “the last refuge of a scoundrel.” It is going to be the means of keeping some more grafters in office in this organization, and it has been clearly proved that it is done to protect a lot of grafters. And I am not going to do like some of the brothers; when I make a statement I am ready to prove it. There has been a lot of grafting going on, and I am not going to take anything back.

DEL. McMULLEN: I would like to ask the brother a question. May I ask a question? Just one question. This question was voted on at the last convention where he and I were members and it showed exactly what the position of that organization is, and you can answer it in your own way. This is the 7th section of our own preamble, the preamble of the Western Federation of Miners, and it reads thus:

“To use all honorable means to maintain and promote friendly relations between ourselves and our employers in endeavoring by arbitration and conciliation and other pacific means to settle any difficulties which may arise between us, and thus try to make contention and strikes unnecessary.”

Now I ask you this question: Wasn't it attempted to strike that out at the Denver convention?

DEL. HESLEWOOD: Yes.

DEL. McMULLEN: Am I not right in saying that is the sentiment that permeated the Western Federation of Miners as an organization? Now I ask the question; answer it in your own way.

DEL. HESLEWOOD: Yes, that was voted on, and it was my fault that it was not passed. I take the blame here at this time for that preamble not being eliminated and the preamble of the Industrial Workers of the World substituted in its place. I want to say that that resolution was defeated by one-half vote, and I held four votes from the Haywood Miners' Union and happened to be sick at that time, and that is why it was defeated.

Now, it is an undisputed fact that there has been a lot of grafting going on in the offices of this organization, and this idea, this scheme of the revolutionists at this time, will abolish this thing as fast as possible. I want to say that night before last there was something between \$800 and \$900 paid to men that are sitting around here as stool pigeons and who have done no constructive work in the organization whatever, except running around and buying white buttons or something to that effect, or refusing a referendum to the rank and file, deposing organizers and firing men out of office that knew more about organized labor than the whole bunch of tacticians—more than they knew or ever will know, and I refer to Bro. John Riordan. I would like to ask where your democracy and where your referendum comes in. That is the work that has been going on. That is the straw that broke the camel's back with these fellows. They are trying to hold on to the last straw to keep their jobs, and we are determined at this time that they will not hold their jobs, and that the whole bunch that yell “referendum” may hit the stretch and get a job somewhere else. Probably at the next convention, when we get this atmosphere clarified a little and get rid of some of these \$8-a-day boys that are living off of a lot of you roosters from New York and elsewhere, that get 80 and 90 cents a day—probably next year we will have a referendum vote, and if we

do it will be to the best interests of the revolutionary organization as laid down in the preamble of this constitution.

DEL. FOX: Mr. Chairman and Delegates, it is strange that those who plead so eloquently for the rank and file and weep for a referendum should want to foist an absolute autocrat upon this convention. That is what they want to do. They deny to the people who sit here in convention the right to elect their own chairman, a right that is denied to hardly any other deliberative assembly in any country. You have that right. After abolishing the president of this organization it is your legal right in law, because the convention is the highest law of the Industrial Workers of the World, according to the constitution. There is no sense in these men asserting that we are violating the law. We are living up to the law. It is they who are violating it, they who are impeding our actions every hour by their dilatory tactics. Why say that the rank and file should have the right to elect a president of this organization when you have decreed that there shall be no president? How can they elect one? You have none there, and must yourselves elect your chairman. The government of this organization, as I understand, is to be by an Executive Board, whom you shall elect before this convention has concluded its deliberations. So there is no reason in the plea, and if these men wish to desert—wish to desert because this convention chooses, according to the law it has made, to elect a chairman, let them go and appeal to their organization, we will tell those people the truth, and we will see whether or not there are men and sections in the West who oppose the true law of the Industrial Workers of the World.

DEL. DUNCAN: I want to call the attention of Bro. McMullen and the organization to the fact that there is such a thing as provisional law. Provisional law is sometimes made necessary. Now, in taking up the subject of a chairman for this organization we are only providing for this convention here. This act of electing a chairman here in no way affects the rank and file, and in voting for the contention of the appellant in this case as against the chairman I do not in any way take a stand against the referendum. I stand for the referendum, and for its fullest usage. But in this case if this law has got to be submitted to a referendum in order to be made binding upon the whole organization—and it will not, I contend, bind the whole organization until it is submitted to a referendum—what is going to bind this convention here? Surely not a law that we have just repealed. We have got to have something to take the place of that law that we have repealed besides absolute anarchism and chaos. Bro. McMullen would not stand for anarchy. I do not stand for anarchy. We have got to have something to govern our officers here, and I submit to you that the most reasonable thing we can do is to take the acts of this convention itself and make them our provisional law.

DEL. HANNEMANN: Mr. Chairman and fellow delegates. I hold that the mover of this motion is making a high-handed attempt to violate again the constitution of the I. W. W. I hold that if this motion is carried we are violating the rights of the rank and file of the I. W. W. The Industrial Workers of the World must have a head and a central head, call it President, call it Secretary-Treasurer or whatever you may. We find that under the present condition of things it is the proper thing for us to have a central head.

DEL. ROTKOVITZ: A point of order. According to the resolution brought in yesterday by the Constitution Committee it was adopted to do away with or abolish the office of President. It was abolished yesterday. Therefore I don't see any use of debating that subject. I ask for a ruling.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: I believe the point of order is not well taken. If that were true I think it would be unnecessary, for the motion that is now before the house, and if the motion is in order I believe the debate is in order.

DEL. MAHONEY: I would take it at this time, listening to the discussion that has been carried on on this floor, that there were men that thought to contradict themselves for the purpose of carrying a point. I would take it that when men get up here and say that they believe in things going to the rank and file, and then take the position that they have taken, that they are acting honestly so far as the motion goes, because I feel that the men that they represent are the rank and file of that class. I feel that they speak honestly as far as they are concerned, but I feel that I am one that am not yet a fanatic. I hear men come here and holler "Revolution" and holler about organization, who possibly never belonged to an organized body of 2,000 men in their lives. But I claim to have been in an organized movement for from twelve to twenty years, and here men get up here and seeing that the election of a President is provided for in the constitution by a referendum vote, they get up here and say that they can do away with that clause without the referendum vote. If the argument of Del. De Leon here this morning is correct, then the office of President should still stand. Yet he voted against his own argument, and his colleagues that belong to this organization voted with him. I would take it when he stated that this portion of this constitution which provided for a referendum vote should go to a referendum vote, not unless demanded, that he took the position that the only way that this convention could depose the President or do away with that office was to prefer charges against the President if he has violated his obligation, throw him out, and then submit the question of doing away with the office to a referendum vote of the rank and file. And we have discussed around here as to the preamble of this constitution, and Del. McMullen cited the preamble of some other constitution. I take the preamble of this constitution as the preamble of every member of the Industrial Workers of the World, and I recognize it as the preamble of the Industrial Workers of the World. I recognize that constitution as the constitution of the Industrial Workers of the World until it is amended. I contend that this aggregation here today has not got the right to pass one amendment and immediately put it in force. I contend that if this convention was disposed to be fair that they would have willingly decided whether or not this constitution shall go to a referendum vote. I hear much said on this floor as to the trickery of members who they claim are in the employ of the employing class for the purpose of defeating the members and agents of this organization. I take it that through the contention of Del. De Leon he has put the trickery and the connivance and the dirt and the lies of the corporations in the dark. I contend that when I make a statement I am amply able to live up to that statement, and I take it that the man that is leading this fight on this floor is not living up to the statements that he made. When the contention arose here on the submission of the report of your Constitution Committee the question immediately arose as to how it was going to be acted on. He, as the leader of that committee on this floor, stated to this convention that it would not be in effect until all the amendments were acted on, and that there was no need for any fear on the part of any delegate that they were going to be deprived of the right to place that constitution together and then act on it intelligently. I take it now that he has violated that statement and that when he made that statement he deliberately lied. I hear much said of the men who represent the

rank and file in this convention. I would like to have some of the delegates count the men who are hollering "Rank and file" and find out who they represent according to the books of this organization. That is my position. I am here for the purpose of acting honestly, and I defy any man to show me where I have not so acted, and so far as my record is concerned in the labor movement it is an open book. And as I stated here yesterday, when any man wants to name me I want him to call me Mahoney. I want him to prefer charges and I want to say "Shame!" to a dirty cur that offers insinuations without preferring them. That is all I have got to say.

DEL. PARKS: Mahoney, may I ask a question?

DEL. MAHONEY: Yes, you may.

DEL. PARKS: All right. Just wait.

THE CHAIRMAN: Del. Parks, you ask your question and then the brother behind you has the floor.

DEL. PARKS: I want to establish a fact, whether or not. It has been said to me that you draw from the Western Federation of Miners the sum of \$150 a month in your official position connected with the Western Federation of Miners. Is that correct?

DEL. MAHONEY: That is correct.

DEL. PARKS: Is it not a fact that you also draw \$5 a day as a member of the Executive Board of the Industrial Workers of the World, and that your Executive Board have also voted you \$3 a day expense money during this convention?

DEL. MAHONEY: That is not correct.

DEL. PARKS: Is it not a fact that you draw \$5 a day while you are acting as a member of the Executive Board of the Industrial Workers of the World?

DEL. MAHONEY: That is correct.

DEL. PARKS: That is correct. And do you draw expense money as a member of the Industrial Workers of the World while you are in session?

DEL. MAHONEY: I do.

DEL. PARKS: How much expense money do the members of the Executive Board get while they are in convention as members of the Executive Board of the I. W. W.?

DEL. MAHONEY: The stipulation of the Executive Board was \$3 a day expense money.

DEL. PARKS: Three dollars a day expense money. The Executive Board have power to make their own salary and vote themselves their own expense money, have they not?

DEL. MAHONEY: That is the supposition of the constitution.

DEL. PARKS: Yes, and you are acting on that supposition, are you not? That is all the questions I want to ask.

DEL. MAHONEY: I do not deny it.

DEL. PARKS: All right.

DEL. MAHONEY: As I said before, anything that I have got I will tell you.

DEL. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, I voted to do away with the President of this organization, as I was instructed by my local to vote that way. I intended to vote to unseat him now. But as the opposition call themselves revolutionists and have arrayed themselves against what they call the reactionists, the autocrats, and show the same autocratic spirit that is shown on the other side by not letting the referendum go out, I will have to reverse and say that he shall remain until the rank and file says he shall go out. The autocratic spirit was shown in the beginning of this convention on the credentials. The autocratic spirit

was shown on that side against the stenographic report from the start. The autocratic spirit was shown all through, and they were opposed as a body of men that termed themselves revolutionists and say they are revolutionists now. I say that any man that does not stand for democracy and that does not stand for a complete referendum on our actions here, is not a revolutionist in any sense of the word. I ask what right you have to come to the convention assembled and say you are the brains of this organization? I tell you there are men working in the mines and factories that know more than some that are elected on this floor. I say, gentlemen, if this organization goes on record as not putting out the referendum vote on these entire proceedings it goes on record as an autocratic body. And the rank and file is demanding a referendum on this, and I will vote for a referendum. If those men want to go, let them go, but I will state that I will be with the little minority who are demanding the referendum. And I shall stand against that man; whether he be this man, whether he be Sherman or whether he be De Leon, he is an autocrat and he can keep this power in the palm of his hand, but he will not keep me.

DEL. PARKS: I want to ask the delegate just one question.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Cox has the floor. Now ask your question.

DEL. PARKS: Del. Moore, I wish to ask you a question. Do you belong to any political party?

DEL. MOORE: I do not, sir.

DEL. PARKS: Is it not a fact that you proclaim yourself to be an anarchist?

DEL. MOORE: No, sir, it is not. That comes from that dirty sheet.

DEL. PARKS: Did you not affirm the other day that you did not believe in the ballot?

DEL. MOORE: I do not believe in it.

DEL. PARKS: You do not believe in the ballot?

DEL. MOORE: No.

DEL. PARKS: If you do not believe in the ballot why do you ask the rank and file to vote upon these questions, then?

DEL. MOORE: I have had a question directed at me. Now he comes back with a question. He asked the question whether I believe in the ballot. I said capitalist ballot—a capitalist ballot box, no. I said the only ballot that the revolutionist has got is in his industrial organization. I so contend.

DEL. COX: Mr. Chairman and fellow-delegates, I do not ask the floor because I want to go down in this stenographic report, but since everybody has taken the floor and taken a sweep I want to say just a few words, not very many. I want to say that I came instructed to put out the grafters in the I. W. W. For this reason: I have been in the field for the revolutionary movement a number of times, and since the launching—yes, prior to the launching of the I. W. W., I was preaching industrial unionism, and when an autocratic Executive Board put hobbles on my local and put me in a position where I could no longer preach, I became rebellious. Therefore I come here to put out that autocratic body. When I go before the rank and file, the wage slaves in the mines, mills and factories, and they are standing before me when I am preaching industrialism, I cannot come to them because of that autocratic rule. When they come before me and say, "Your President is getting \$1,800 a year and railroad fare and expenses; these expenses all come from us"—that is exactly the way the rank and file sees it; when they look at it they say, "This is as bad as Sam Gompers." When they come to me with these things I tell them the truth, and it has gone

out throughout the country that we had an autocartie Executive Board. We all know it; the rank and file know it. Now, what I want is this: I want to take a vote on this proposition, and I want to see an Executive Board put in here that will do the organizing in the field themselves, because the rank and file are back of this organization and want to get rid of fakirs right now. I say I want to get through with this convention and go to the field and help organize the slaves.

DEL. KIRKPATRICK: I would like to ask a question of the speaker. Wasn't there a referendum from the Industrial Council of St. Louis?

DEL. COX: Yes.

DEL. KIRKPATRICK: Did you not send out a communication to all delegates asking them to join the Socialist Labor Party?

DEL. COX: No, sir.

DEL. KIRKPATRICK: I want to state to this convention that I sat in the council in St. Louis and I know.

THE CHAIRMAN: The matter is out of order at this time. Just ask your question.

DEL. KIRKPATRICK: I would like to ask another question. Is it not a fact that there was \$50 borrowed from the general organization and you applied it on your wages?

DEL. COX: No.

DEL. KIRKPATRICK: The secretary has it. I would say that this revolutionist made the statement—

DEL. PARKS: A point of order, Mr. Chairman. The point of order is that the gentleman has the floor only to ask a question. If he wants to make a speech he can make it afterwards.

THE CHAIRMAN: You can have the floor later on.

DEL. KIRKPATRICK: I want to ask another question.

THE CHAIRMAN: Ask the question.

DEL. KIRKPATRICK: Instead of organizing an industrial union wasn't it an S. T. L. A.?

DEL. COX: No, sir.

DEL. DUNCAN: I just want to say that we merely elect the chairman and make provision for submitting all the provisions to an entire referendum vote of the I. W. W. Just the same as if we had not taken this action.

DEL. MOORE: Was that question asked me?

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you desire to answer it?

DEL. MOORE: Do you ask a question?

DEL. DUNCAN: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have a right to answer.

DEL. MOORE: As I understand the framer of this constitution and the member of the Constitution Committee now says the referendum shall not go out again the same as prior, he says, except on the election of officers; that that shall be the only referendum that there shall be.

DEL. KEOGH: Mr. Chairman. I am opposed to this action here in this convention at the present time, and the reason of my opposition to this action is that this convention is not organized at the will of the majority of the members of the Industrial Workers of the World. When I look around in the town that I come from and hear and see the voices and the names of all here and the votes they have got, I will state to this convention that it is not the vote of the majority of the members of the Industrial Workers of the World that is recorded here on each vote, and I challenge contradiction. I challenge contradiction in this way, that for the last year or year and four months since this organization was formed we have had several local charters issued to New York and vicinity. The moment that we have got 16 or 17 members into a local



in New York City we then branch out and form another local. Bro. De Leon here, the leader of this convention, does not represent 200 men in New York, and the records of the secretary of the Industrial Workers of the World will prove that they are not paid up to date. Bro. Moskovitz from New York does not represent anything near 200 members of the Industrial Workers of the World from New York, and a convention packed under those conditions is not an honest convention of the Industrial Workers of the World. That is the reason I stand here, fellow delegates, to protest against any action that may be taken here without it is first referred to the rank and file, as I understood would be done when they took us into the industrial movement. I hear this thing of fakirism and revolutionists. What do you mean by revolutionist? I defy any man in this convention to show that I am accused of being a fakir, and I bar none, that has suffered more or spent more for the labor movement than I have. I defy any man from New York—I defy you, De Leon—during the years I have been in the labor movement, to show one action of mine that was not calculated to build up the industrial movement. Bro. Riordan, you have been associated with me five years in the industrial and labor movement in Butte from the date of the American Labor Union. I believe I was in the Western Federation of Labor at that time, an industrial movement—and then be accused here as a fakir. To call that name when they swell the representation in this convention without taxation is not honest in any man, and if you form an organization on those lines I want to tell you it is going down, and it will go down before you leave this convention if you take this action, if the movement that you are taking now is going to be carried out, because it is not the voice of the rank and file of the members that is heard here on the floor of this convention and I defy contradiction by the books of the Industrial Workers of the World.

DEL. FOX: That is not true. I have four votes and represent 10 locals, and we did not claim the other six. I represent three men that have gone.

THE CHAIRMAN: Order.

DEL. KEOGH: If this packed convention denies the right to the rank and file to vote on our action, I am satisfied for my action to go broadcast before the rank and file. I beg and ask this convention to let all our actions go before the rank and file, and whatever the rank and file will vote on our actions, then I want to say to you that then I will be as faithful as any worker, as any revolutionist or so-called revolutionist in this convention, but not before the rank and file endorses our action here in this convention.

DEL. FORBERG: I would like to ask the comrade a question.

DEL. LINGENFELTER: I want to ask Keogh a question.

DELEGATES: Sit down!

THE CHAIRMAN: Come to order, please.

DEL. LINGENFELTER: Bro. Keogh, aren't you a member of the Credentials Committee?

DEL. KEOGH: Yes.

DEL. LINGENFELTER: Did you not pass upon the credentials which gave me a seat in this convention?

DEL. KEOGH: According to the books every local is entitled to a delegate.

DEL. LINGENFELTER: You passed upon the credentials and seated me here?

DEL. KEOGH: I seated men that paid \$5 for 6 months from the locals.

DEL. LINGENFELTER: You did?

DEL. KEOGH: Yes.

DEL. LINGENFELTER: Then you agreed to pack the convention, according to your own statement.

DEL. KEOGH: That is according to the constitution of the organization, that we should seat members from locals that were in good standing, no matter what their membership was.

DEL. PARKS: May I ask a question of Bro. Keogh? Is it not a fact that Del. McKinnon who comes here from New York has not been a member of the Industrial Workers of the World more than about 40 days?

DEL. KEOGH: About that, I guess.

DEL. PARKS: About that.

DEL. KEOGH: Yes.

DEL. PARKS: Is it not a fact that Bro. Sherman had Shurtleff what he called withdraw from this organization and hurried away by railroad and then turned around in order to throw a fight on the constitution into the Committee on Credentials and not allow it to come up in an orderly way before the convention?

DEL. KEOGH: In answer to the brother's question, the men in New York did not take any action on this. That is why we got in a fight in the organization. Let me say to you, Parks, that there are as good fighters in McKinnon's organization as any individual or delegate on this floor.

DEL. RICHTER: They have not got the votes.

DEL. KEOGH: We paid no attention to your fights throughout the East. Why didn't those parties that protested, 400 men—why didn't they protest against the organization that was paying only on 18 men and then some of them withdrew and formed another local? Will you answer that question? In New York the Bronx Building Trades had 18 men according to the books here. Bro. Kinneally was elected president of another local of the railroad workers. Is that an honest form of organization or is it packing the convention?

DEL. PARKS: The question I wished to ask you was: You voted with the bunch on this man McKinnon who was seated?

DEL. MCKINNON: A point of order.

DEL. PARKS: He said here he would get an injunction out against us if he couldn't rule this convention, did he not?

DEL. McMULLEN: Parks, didn't the man who made the protest withdraw it?

THE CHAIRMAN: I think, brother, you are out of order in bringing that up.

DEL. KEOGH: I want to tell you that I voted against the withdrawal of that. It was for the convention to say what they would do.

DEL. KINNEALLY: I want to ask a question. Is it not a fact that I, J. J. Kinneally, a delegate on this floor, was elected according to the credentials to represent Local Union 179 of New York?

DEL. KEOGH: Bronx borough, I believe.

DEL. KINNEALLY: Bronx borough; well, that is part of New York.

DEL. KEOGH: When you came before that convention—

DEL. KINNEALLY: Now, is that true, yes or no?

DEL. KEOGH: Yes, but there were doubts about your being elected on account of another local.

DEL. KINNEALLY: That is so much.

DEL. KEOGH: There were only 18 members left, and you formed another local out of it, did you not?

DEL. KINNEALLY: I deny that. I assert that there were about 75

in that local, and out of the 75 we have succeeded in organizing a railroad local in the Transportation Department.

DEL. KEOGH: We seated the delegates at large. It is a case of veracity between Bro. Kinneally and me, but I will ask the secretary who paid the per capita tax? The per capita tax is what will show.

THE CHAIRMAN: Come to order.

DEL. FISCHER: Mr. Chairman and Brother Delegates, when I left home I parted with these words: "Boys, the supreme interests of my class shall guide me in my deliberations." Now the interests of my class and of our class are at stake. The issue is very clear. Therefore I beg you not to waste any more lung power in convincing the element that is misrepresenting the condition, but immediately start and act, and the only action before us is to vote, and therefore I move the previous question. (Seconded.)

DEL. DUMAS: I have got a few words.

THE CHAIRMAN: The previous question has been moved and seconded. We will vote on the question whether we will have the previous question.

DEL. McMULLEN: I want to move at this time to lay the previous question on the table. (Seconded.)

DEL. FOX: You can't do that. It is out of order.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is moved and seconded that we lay the motion for the previous question on the table.

DEL. FOX: That is evidently out of order, because it will only call for two roll calls.

DEL. PARKS: I rise to a point of order. That the previous question is a privileged question and the motion to lay it on the table is out of order.

DEL. McMULLEN: Robert's Rules of Order specifically state that a motion to lay the previous question on the table is always in order. If you object to that, of course object.

DEL. KLEESE: I rise to a point of order. The rules adopted by this convention were to the effect that Roberts' Rules of Order would be accepted in so far as they did not retard the progress of this convention. For that reason our action now is on the previous question and not on laying it on the table.

THE CHAIRMAN: I would also state to the brother in answer to his speech. It was tolerated and he was not called to order. That is one reason why the Chair has tolerated a lot of those who did the same. previous question that the rules of order that were adopted by this convention were grossly violated in the opinion of this Chair by the man that made the first motion—

DEL. KLEESE: That is not my point.

THE CHAIRMAN (continuing):—by making a 15 or 20 minute speech. It was tolerated and he was not called to order. That is one reason why the Chair has tolerated a lot of those who did the same. We have all been out of the rules of order as far as the rules of this convention are concerned, since this discussion arose.

DEL. KLEESE: I still hold to my point.

(Roll call demanded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: I believe the motion to lay on the table is in order.

DEL. RICHTER: Proceed to vote.

THE CHAIRMAN: The roll call now occurs on the motion to lay the previous question on the table.

(Del. Mahoney took the chair.)

The roll was proceeded with as far as the name of Del. Hulse.

DEL. O'DONNELL: I represent Huelse, and I have got a communication from that local.

THE SECRETARY: There is another communication from Schweinburg of the same kind.

DEL. O'DONNELL: I presented this communication before the meeting was called to order.

DEL. FOX: A point of order. You can't consider credentials during a roll call.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The Chair would state that I believe the convention will deal fairly with every delegate on this floor. I believe it was the understanding that a transfer would be made through a communication from a local union with the seal of the union attached. Documents are filed here, one from this brother and one from Bro. Schweinburg. If your decision still stands I would take it that since this local union has sent a letter here with the seal of the union attached and with the signatures of the officers vouching that he is appointed to cast the vote for Del. Schweinburg, this delegate here, that they should be so voted. They should have been taken up this morning the first thing.

DEL. FOX: I would agree with that, but Bro. Markley was voted down the other day. They didn't credit them so far as he was concerned. But still I shall vote to seat these two delegates right now.

SECRETARY TRAUTMANN: Then O'Donnell and Schweinburg take the place of Hamrle and Huelse.

The roll call was then completed and resulted: Total vote, 612; yes, 274; no, 338.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The motion to lay on the table is lost. The vote now occurs on, Shall the previous question now be put? The secretary will proceed to call the roll.

A DELEGATE: What is the previous question?

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The previous question is that we proceed to elect a Chairman. Some delegate moved the previous question. The question you are now voting on is, Shall the previous question now be put?

The roll was called and the result announced as follows: Total vote, 631; Yes, 376; No, 255.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The motion is carried. The previous question will be now put, which is that you proceed to elect a chairman. The secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and resulted as follows: Total vote, 622; Yes, 371; No, 251.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The motion is carried.

C. O. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I would ask this convention through the Chair to be given the floor on a special privilege.

It was moved that permission be given.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Is there any objection on the part of any delegate to giving Bro. Sherman the floor? If none, he has the floor.

(Del. Lingenfelter was called to the chair.)

#### REMARKS OF CHARLES O. SHERMAN.

Mr. Chairman, delegates and friends: I desire to say to this convention that the position that I have occupied since the birth of this association was taken because of the request of the delegates of the Western Federation of Miners, after a consideration of twenty-four hours. When I came into the convention of last year I had an understanding with my co-delegate, Brother Kirkpatrick, not knowing at

that time what the deliberation of the convention would be, to the effect that if it became necessary for the Metal Workers to be represented on any Executive Board he would take that position, as I had fully decided to withdraw from the labor movement for at least three years and I did not change my mind until near the close of the convention when called to the hotel at the headquarters of the delegates of the Western Federation of Miners. There I pleaded with them, and asked every delegate that I knew of that I felt could fill the office to accept the position, and was refused. I was offered no relief excepting with one man, and that was a delegate of the Western Federation of Miners, Brother Sullivan, who said to me that he would accept the nomination for president if I would stand for secretary. I declined on the ground that I had served in that capacity with one organization for four years and I was tired of confinement. He immediately declined to have anything to do with it on any other grounds. I accepted the nomination and was elected without any opposition. I stated on this platform that I accepted the constitution and would do the best I could to my fullest ability to carry out that constitution, and I feel that I have done so. I stated at that time, and I do now, that I was not infallible and that perhaps I would make errors, and perhaps I have made errors, but I want to state and go on record that I have done nothing in any of my official acts or any other way that I am ashamed of. I can go before the public and look the rank and file square in the face and say that I feel guilty of nothing. I have done what I thought was best for the organization. If my judgment was not good, then I made an error. I made some mistakes which before I leave this floor I will make clear to you if I am permitted to do so, and I want the errors to appear in this report.

As you all know too well, those of you who were in the last convention and those of you who served as the foundation stones, that while we started out approximately with a large membership, yet outside of the Department of Mining the organization was in a state of chaos. When Brother Trautmann and I took the office we went practically into the office empty-handed, and to this day I do not know what we would have done had it not been for the fact that we took over the property of the A. L. U. with an agreement that we would pay off the standing indebtedness. I do not know what we would have done for implements to have done our work with. Holding the position that I did with the United Metal Workers, I had authority to advance the per capita tax they paid on the first of the month. I did that because we were in a hole to start the work. We went in there with our crude tools, because what we got from the American Labor Union outside of one safe, amounted to practically nothing, when it came to value. It served our purpose, crude as it was, but as to value there was very little value in it.

We worked as mechanics worked in former years, with our crude tools. We worked as brothers and co-operated in every act, as far as I know, until the very opening of our office, when Brother Trautmann came to me and said: "Brother Sherman, there is such an avalanche of work and correspondence here, that I am going to be unable to launch this organization unless I have somebody that is accustomed to office work, and I would ask you do you not think it best to employ Brother Riordan, who has been in the office of the A. L. U. and understands their locals and who will be of great benefit to me in order to shape them into the Industrial Workers of the World? Of course, we would not ask Brother Riordan to work for any less salary than he did for the A. L. U." I immediately agreed, because I wanted to co-operate with

him, as I expected his co-operation with me, and the understanding was with Brother Trautmann that Brother Riordan would be installed in the office for one month.

Our business was very large and burdensome. Brother Trautmann, not being an office man, did not understand organizing an office. I do not condemn him for not having experience. He tried and worked long hours and worked faithfully. At the end of the month he came to me and he said, "Brother Riordan has been in our service about a month. Would you not consent that he would stay two months longer?" I said, "Yes."

He remained two months longer and nothing more was said on the matter, and he remained; but during the time of the July meeting of the Executive Board, and during his whole term of service, I never charged him, to himself, nor at the meeting of the Executive Board did I ever charge Brother Riordan with dishonesty, with laziness, with not tending to business; but on the other hand I stated to the Executive Board that he was a faithful servant, that he worked hard for the organization and worked long hours, and I never questioned for one moment his honesty, nor I do not at this moment. But I stated to the Executive Board that the reason why I asked that he discontinue his services in the office was to this effect: That conditions had arisen in the office to such an extent that the president and the general secretary, as far as co-operation was concerned, had practically become divorced, and that I felt that the employing of any member of the Executive Board at headquarters was not advisable; that I felt that owing to the fact of my being on the road the greater part of my time that Brother Trautmann had consulted Brother Riordan so much during my absence that he continued to do so even when I was in the office.

If I understood the situation at that time, and if I understand it at this time, whenever it is possible the general president during last year was supposed to have charge of the organizing of new organizations. This had been carried out by the secretary, even at such periods as when I was at headquarters. The secretary would get communications pertaining to new organizations, and he would take upon himself to reply to them himself, and many times I did not know that communications were passing between the office and individuals on the proposition of issuing charters until such time as the charter would be issued. Thus the secretary had taken into his own hands that which you have condemned the president of doing, as being officialdom. I do not know why he did it.

Brother Trautmann and I never quarreled. We have had hot words in argument, but it always ended friendly. The strongest argument we ever had was on the construing of the constitution when discussing the proposition of sending out notices or sending out the credentials. He has traveled considerably with me, and he will have to take the terrible stigma upon his back of putting up at the same plutocratic hotels that your president did; we always roomed in the same hotel. My contention is this: that no organization at this time can exist without there is a government, and that the head of that government must be vested with certain powers and functions that he is empowered to carry out which the rank and file will respect.

The convention last year did not make the salary of the secretary nor the president, but the proceedings will show that it was referred to the Executive Board. The Executive Board made the salary, and I believe the minutes of that Executive Board will show that neither Brother Trautmann nor myself took any part in the discussion either

one way or the other, as to what the salaries should be. And if I remember right, when it was put to vote it was a unanimous vote outside of Brother Trautmann and myself. If I remember right, neither one voted on the proposition; I know I did not.

There have men stood on this floor in this convention who saw me in the city of New York, a more fit subject for the hospital, because of the work that I did there in that city, addressing meetings, than a fit subject to go before the rank and file to work. There seemed to be no end to their belief in the endurance of a public speaker. The meetings at New York were very large and I never shirked my duty when I was billed; no matter if it was the third meeting on the same night, I got there even if I did not speak upon the rostrum until eleven o'clock at night. And on several occasions have I been out on those trips when I have requested a comrade to go with me to my hotel, because I felt I was not able to go there physically for fear that I would faint away and fall into the hands of the police and be carried to some unknown hospital; and there are comrades in New York who have taken me to my hotel, rubbed me and helped me to get my clothes off because I was not able to do so, I was so physically reduced from my efforts to teach the rank and file the principles of industrial unionism.

I am an industrial unionist as laid down in my report, and my printed address to this convention. I regret that there are two sides to this convention. To the very depths of my heart do I regret it, because the action of this convention, I felt on the opening of the same, meant much as to the outcome of the case now pending in the Supreme Court relative to a decision that we expect to be handed down regarding our brothers who are incarcerated now in prison.

The records of this convention will show the plutocratic powers that they need have no fear of the Industrial Workers of the World's influence or power, because the Industrial Workers of the World today is a corpse; the spirit will always live, and it will grow, but as an organization the Industrial Workers of the World is now ready for the funeral.

Never mind, boys, never mind, sisters; it is easy to criticise and it is easy to get excited. I know your minds and your thoughts, and I know what it is to organize, and I have heard delegates get up on the floor here and tell what they are going to do with the revolutionary movement, and that they are going to organize the rank and file, and the same delegates have gone out and tried to organize the rank and file with the same revolutionary tactics, and the records show that they have failed.

In this convention I want to serve notice that your ex-president's hands have been tied, but I want to serve notice that he is not licked. The fight ain't over; it has just started. We heard not many days ago about sifting out the grain and the chaff, and the sifting is taking place, and when we count the votes of those who will line up for Industrial Unionism I am satisfied that I will stand with the majority. I will be willing to rest my case with the rank and file and submit to their decision.

I regret that there are two sides to this convention, because the human family, the worker everywhere, is looking for and needing organization. He is needing that doctrine that will bring co-operation, that will bring together the working class, that they may learn to co-operate in shop and factory, that they will act and move as one.

But the proceedings of this convention when going before the rank and file will be evidence to them that they can not follow the proceedings of this convention and hope that there is going to be a unification of the working class of this or any other country. When the sifting

out comes and you check up the Industrial Workers of the World after the adjournment of this convention you will find that instead of numbering 60,000 the number will be reduced very much, and you will find the large organization of the working class will not be numbered with the Industrial Workers of the World.

I have not done anything that I regret only this: friends of mine with whom I had associated previous to my accepting the position of president, informed me that within the year I would discover that I had got in bed with a class of people that were after my scalp and after the scalp of the organization. And the proceedings that will go before this organization in the way of a financial report will show that there has been a connection between the general secretary's office and the S. L. P. in the way of throwing work to the New York Labor News Company. The statement was made by your secretary on this floor the other day that the Joliet Republican Printing Company threatened to pinch the organization; I took it from what he said that they threatened him trouble, or the organization. Brother Trautmann as a man, regardless of his feelings or his ideas as to the form of organization, should certainly weigh his words. The very man who is the agent for the Joliet Republican Printing Company—the printing company that gave us the best service that was ever given to this organization—went his security for his rent when he came to this town to serve as general secretary. The reason why the Joliet Republican Printing Company was pushing the secretary was this, that we owed them something, about \$3,000.00, and instead of continuing to give the Joliet Republican Printing Company our business he transferred much of the business in the way of pamphlets to the New York Labor News Company and paid them spot cash for every delivery and was not paying on the debt incurred with the Joliet Republican Printing Company. That was the reason why they were dissatisfied, and I think they have a reason to be dissatisfied when they carry a customer and then they find that after a big bill has been incurred, he goes somewhere else when cash is to be paid. I do this as I feel I am in duty bound to do to make clear these points, because that firm's name has been brought into this convention, and I want to say to you that the New York Labor News Company—so stated by the secretary—is not in a position to carry an indebtedness for the Industrial Workers of the World. There was no printing company came to the Industrial Workers of the World in our infancy and offered to do our printing, that ran into a good many hundred dollars, necessary to launch our organization, but one, and that was the Joliet Republican Printing Company, through the fact that the ex-president had done business with that firm for four years, and it was through his reputation we got the credit.

Do away, boys and girls, with all this excitement and sentiment, and get down to business facts. Look the thing square in the face as a business proposition. A labor organization is not a plaything. It must be run on a business basis if it is going to run and be successful.

I am not pleading for office. If I had wanted an office, better than the one that you gave me, I could have quit six months ago and got one that would have paid me more than the Industrial Workers of the World.

With all of the graft that has been spoken about here I failed to have any of it stick to my fingers, and to-day I am \$150.00 worse off than I was when I took the office. If there has been any graft I have not seen any of it. I have gone out and represented your organization. In many cases my expenses for this have been high. I put up at decent hotels, generally commercial houses, houses which I would not be



ashamed to be found in, either by the hardest working man or the mayor of the city, and I am not ashamed of it; and the larger part of the organization, our membership, would not respect a president that did not conduct himself in that way. And in many places in the industrial centers your president has got off of the train and there met a committee of workmen who had previous to his arrival arranged for his hotel accommodations; and on several occasions refused to accept the arrangement because it was at a better house than I should put up with. Take it in the city of Schenectady, that you have heard so much of. The workers there are proud of their representatives and there is nothing too good for them in Schenectady. They do not want their president nor their secretary to go there in a pair of overalls and put up at a boarding house. They want him to put up at a good hotel, and they don't complain of the expense. Remarks have been made here about money spent in many places. Take it in the West; when they want a man to go out and do something they tell him to go out and do it regardless of cost; and they spend more money there locally than your president would spend.

And I will say to you in conclusion that if you believe that an organization can be built and live on mere sentiment without a business proposition, you are going to be sadly disappointed. The organization as it exists now as a whole has a fairly good start. It strains every sinew of the organization to hold itself intact when assaulted by the master and moneyed class, and if you think you can reduce your membership and hold it intact on a principle, I want to say to you that you are going to starve to death on that principle just as the brothers had become when they hollered to have a suspension of a part of the constitution that they might have an income to live at this convention. The same condition occurs in a strike. If you are going to have a standing army—which a governing organization is—there must be a commissary train behind that army and in close touch, and if that commissary train is not there, then the efforts on the part of the master class are going to be successful.

In closing I wish to say this, that I apologize to my many friends who said to me at the opening of my term of office that within a year the S. L. P. would control the Industrial Workers of the World. I accept the scoffs that come to me over the telephone every day, calling me up and saying, "Sherman, I told you so, that DeLeon would control the next convention." (Laughter.)

Delegate DeLeon has controlled this convention, which he had a right to do if he wanted to, and which he has carried out systematically, automatically, and like all good machines that work without friction, or without a squeal. But I will say to my friends through this report that I admit that my judgment was bad, and while I endorse the underlying principles that are advocated by the Socialist Labor Party, I want to go on record that I am opposed to their tactics, and I do not hesitate to say that time will demonstrate to the working class that their tactics are suicide to the movement. Their tactics were suicide to the S. T. L. A. that died because of its tactics.

There have been statements made on this floor and remarks that means the driving out from this industrial movement of the real organizers, the men who do go out and interest the rank and file. I do not hesitate to say as I said in my report that I believe today the rank and file are better prepared and more anxious and realize the necessity of industrialism more than they did a year ago today, but what they want as they told me they wanted it in New York and in hundreds

of other places, is industrial unionism, an economic industrial organization with no taint of S. L. P.

Now to those of you who have assisted in building up the organization during my term of office, I desire to thank you one and all to the very depths of my heart, and I appreciate the fact that had it not been for the co-operation of the rank and file and their many sacrifices your president would have been unable to make as good a report as he did as to the standing of the organization. And I wish through this report to extend my sincere gratitude and thanks to all of our friends throughout this land who have given us words of encouragement and who have worked for the organization. I do not thank them because they did anything for me personally, but I thank them in behalf of humanity. And I wish to briefly state to you that I hope the time will come when a convention of the workers will be held and there will be no sides; that there will be an intermingling of delegates and it will not matter on what side of the house I sit or what chair they occupy, the same work will go on with harmony and unity as if everybody took their regular seat at their regular table and watched the regular wink of the master as has been going on in this convention. I hope that time is not far distant, and I do not believe it is, because I believe a trial of what is going to follow from this convention will be convincing to many an honest man and woman that the tactics employed here and the form of organization advocated here are a hundred years ahead of time.

We hear so much about the revolution. We hear so much about men bleeding that some would think their shoes were dripping with the blood of humanity; and some of those who belong to the same class of society have eaten meals with your plutocratic president, so-called, and not one of them ever protested that I ever invited them to put their feet under a table that was too good for them. And on several occasions have I asked them to have a drink, and it did not seem to strangle them to drink out of the same bottle that your president did.

Well, I do not think that honestly, in the hearts of any delegates here, they feel that there was any serious charges to be preferred against the president, only that he exercised authority that he should not have exercised. That which I have done I felt was to the best interests of the workers. I feel yet that I did not make a mistake, and I have no apologies to make, neither have I any regrets. And in leaving your convention, now that I have been unseated as chairman and as a delegate, I would say to you from a personal standpoint, that I leave you with no malice in my heart toward any individual. No matter what you have said, from the very depths of my heart I love you just the same, one and all, and thank you for your kind attention.

#### ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The first order of business will be the election of a chairman.

DEL. FOOTE: I rise to place in nomination Bro. John Riordan as Chairman. (Seconded.) Del. Riordan declined.

DEL. FOOTE: You can't decline. You don't wish to occupy the chair in this convention.

DEL. FREUH: I nominate Bro. Trautmann.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: It is twelve o'clock. Do you wish to adjourn?

DELEGATES: No.

DEL. DE LEON: I want to know whether Delegate Mahoney expects to stay during the convention.

DEL. MAHONEY: How?

DEL. DE LEON: Does Delegate Mahoney expect to stay during the convention, or does he expect to leave before the convention adjourns?

DEL. MAHONEY: I will state that I expect to stay to the end of the convention.

DEL. DE LEON: Well, then, I nominate Delegate Mahoney. (Seconded.)

DEL. MAHONEY: Thanking the delegate for his nomination, I would respectfully decline, as I think there are delegates on the floor that possibly are better qualified to occupy the position of Chairman of this convention.

DEL. DESMOND: I nominate Delegate Fox. (Seconded.)

Del. St. John was nominated. Sec. Trautmann declined.

DEL. BROWN: I nominate Heselwood.

(Delegate Heselwood declined.)

(Del. Ryan was nominated, and declined.)

(Del Fitzgerald moved that the nominations be closed. Seconded.)

(Del. DeLeon nominated St. John. Seconded.)

DEL. RIORDAN: I wish to raise an objection against the nomination of those who control such a large vote as St. John or Albert Ryan.

DEL. DE LEON: An objection has been raised. As to my nominee I want to state that that objection does not hold good. I would state that if a delegate who has a large number of votes is in the chair, then when there is an appeal from his decision he might be so modest as not to wish to sustain himself. I believe Delegate St. John has got over that, and I don't believe there is any danger.

DEL. RIORDAN: All right.

DEL. DE LEON: Any member of the organization who has a right to vote, if put in the chair, and when his name comes in regular rotation, has the right to vote and he should vote. I believe Delegate St. John will so understand it.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: I want to say in answer to the objection, that if Delegate St. John does not decline and wishes to stand as a candidate the objection is overruled. It is up to St. John himself as an individual to say whether or not he will accept or decline.

DEL. DUNCAN: I think, in nominating a man for this office, we ought to be, especially in this hall, guided by his qualifications in regard to making his decisions heard. I therefore nominate Bro. Veal. (Seconded.)

DEL. VEAL: I decline because I recognize the fact that it requires men who know something about parliamentary tactics and who have been trained in that school. Now, I want you to take this into consideration, and I give way to some of the rest of the delegates, and I would ask the mover of this motion to accept that statement.

(On motion of Delegate Heselwood the nominations were closed.)

DEL. FOX: I would like to withdraw, and I move the unanimous vote for St. John. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Delegate Fox has withdrawn, and with the consent of the second he will be withdrawn.

DEL. HANNEMANN: I rise to a point of personal privilege.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Please sit down till I put the motion before the house, will you?

DEL. HANNEMANN: I would like to ask a question on a matter of personal privilege. Mr. Chairman—

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Then keep quiet till I put the motion. It has been regularly moved and seconded that the election of St. John be made unanimous. Are you ready for the question? (Question called

for.) Is there any objection? All in favor of the unanimous election of Bro. St. John as chairman will signify it by saying aye. Contrary, no. The ayes have it; Brother St. John is elected. (Applause.) The meeting will be held in the smaller hall in the afternoon. We will adjourn till one o'clock.

DEL. HANNEMANN: You promised to recognize me on a point of personal privilege.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: All right.

DEL. HANNEMANN: It will take me just a minute.

(Chairman St. John took the chair.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Brother Hannemann has the floor.

DEL. HANNEMANN: I rise to a point of personal privilege. Mr. Chairman, and fellow delegates, I desire to announce that my character has been assailed by the representatives of the Daily People of New York by publishing false reports.

DEL. DE LEON: A point of order, Mr. Chairman. This convention is an economic organization that owns one paper, the Industrial Worker, and the statements in any other paper, particularly a political paper, cannot be brought into this convention. If you bring in one you have to bring them all. What is the ruling?

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair will rule that the point is well taken; that what is in the Daily People has nothing to do with this convention.

DEL. HANNEMANN: I would just like to ask a question. Now, the character of my conduct is not political. That paper, like every other newspaper or whatever it may be, has made statements—

DEL. DE LEON: A point of order.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair will rule, Delegate Hannemann, that you have no right to take up the time of this convention in refuting any charges made in any paper. If there are any charges that you desire to refute, or desire a question of privilege where they are made on the floor of this convention you will have the floor; otherwise not. What is your further pleasure? If there is no objection the convention will now adjourn until 2 o'clock this afternoon, to meet in the other hall. The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Adjourned until 2 P. M., Sept. 28.

#### FRIDAY, SEPT. 28.—AFTERNOON SESSION.

The convention was called to order at 2 o'clock by Chairman St. John.

THE CHAIRMAN: What is the order of business before the house?

DEL. FOX: I move that those brothers who have credentials should be seated, so that they will not get up later when there is a vote and have their credentials read. I would ask general consent to that.

THE CHAIRMAN: If there is no objection, if the secretary has any credentials to be read they will be read.

DEL. PARKS: I ask as a question of personal privilege—

THE CHAIRMAN: You have the floor. What is it?

DEL. PARKS: I have been accused here on the floor of this convention of stating that the S. L. P. is controlling the convention.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Parks, if you will allow, the Chair would make a ruling that your question of personal privilege is not in order at this time. I do not know that we want to take up time discussing whether the S. L. P. controls this convention or not.

DEL. PARKS: I just want to go on record, in reply to the statement that the S. L. P. controlled our actions, by saying that it is not true.

THE CHAIRMAN: You may go on record that way. The secretary says that anybody who has credentials may pass them over to the Chairman of the Committee on Credentials. We will proceed with the report of the Committee on Constitution.

#### REPORT ON CONSTITUTION.

DEL. KINNEALLY: Mr. Chairman and delegates, the Committee on Constitution requests the adoption of the following resolution by this body:

WHEREAS, Since there is but one department in existence, we recommend that the General Executive Board for the coming year shall consist of a member of that department (the Mining Department) and five additional members elected at large by this convention from various parts of the country, besides the General Secretary-Treasurer and the Assistant General Secretary-Treasurer.

It was moved and seconded to concur in the report.

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been regularly moved and seconded that this resolution introduced by the Constitution Committee be concurred in. You have heard the motion; are you ready for the question? (Question.) The question has been called for. If there is no objection the resolution will be adopted unanimously.

DEL. ROGERS: I would like to ask a question in regard to that. The delegate has said that these members of this Board are to be elected. Some of them—more than one—can be chosen out of the Western Federation of Miners, can they not?

A DELEGATE: Certainly.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is the pleasure of the convention, as to who they are.

DEL. MARKLEY: That will come up under the head of nominations. Question.

DEL. McKINNON: It was suggested by the committee that two be men to be appointed in New York. The Secretary did not read that. Of course I don't know whether it is necessary to read that or not. It was suggested at the time that the headquarters of the organization be at Chicago, but that members in at least two eastern districts should be chosen as members of the Executive Board.

DEL. KINNEALLY: I never heard any such suggestion in the committee.

DEL. McKINNON: Mr. Chairman, I call on Bro. Fischer. Is Brother Fischer here?

DEL. FOX: I rise to a point of order. It seems to me we are only—

DEL. McKINNON: Wasn't it the suggestion, Fischer, that two men be taken from New York?

DEL. FOX: I would like to make a point of order on this.

THE CHAIRMAN: If you will just let the delegate get through with Delegate Fischer I think it will be more easily arrived at than by a point of order.

DEL. FISCHER: I am not a member of the Constitution Committee, and therefore have nothing to suggest.

DEL. McKINNON: What is that?

DEL. FISCHER: I am not a member of the Constitution Committee.

DEL. McKINNON: Didn't you put in a resolution to that effect, or something to that effect, that two men be chosen from New York?

DEL. FISCHER: No, sir; Local 130 put in a resolution to the effect that delegates shall be chosen from different parts of the country, and nothing else. That is on record.

DEL. McKINNON: Wasn't it from New York?

DEL. FISCHER: No, sir, there is nothing in it.

DEL. McKINNON: Then I will take my seat. I must have been mistaken.

THE CHAIRMAN: If there is no objection now the resolution will be adopted by unanimous consent.

DEL. McKNIGHT: I wish to be recorded as objecting to that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any further objection? If not it is so ordered, one delegate voting in the negative, Delegate McKnight. The secretary of the Constitution Committee has the floor.

DEL. KINNEALLY: The committee offers the following article:

"MIXED LOCALS. No member of a trade that is organized in his locality is qualified for admission in a mixed local in the same locality, and no member of a mixed local can remain a member of the same after his trade has been organized in that locality."

DEL. SHENKAN: I move its adoption. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been regularly moved and seconded that this resolution submitted by the Committee on Constitution in regard to mixed locals be adopted. You have heard the motion; are you ready for the question? (Question called for.)

DEL. DE LEON: I want to speak on the question. It is well to know why this provision was adopted by the Committee on Constitution. An abuse has crept into the organization. Mixed locals are formed for the purpose of acting as recruiting stations for the industries. Men of various trades gather in those mixed locals. After the trade of any one of the members has been organized in that locality, that man should pull out and all those who are in that particular trade should pull out. If they do not pull out they accomplish two mischiefs: one is not to be connected with their trade, and in so far hampering the movement of the organization. Another is that by staying there, if they should join their trade they have a double vote. Now, it was stated here in the course of the morning, as a grave charge against one of the locals in the Bronx, that with only a few members in the transportation business, those members pulled out and organized a local in the Transportation Department. Now, if a man in a particular trade joins a mixed local it must be when his trade in that locality is not organized. If his trade in that locality is organized, he has no business to be in the mixed local and he should join the local of his trade, and if he joined a mixed local before his trade was organized he should immediately leave it and join the local of his trade; because if he were to be allowed to remain in two locals we would have the trouble that arose with the Musicians, that men would be in two locals and would come here with double representation, and that same thing is happening now with regard to some mixed locals. That is the reason that was introduced.

DEL. PARKS: Mr. Chairman, now I am not opposed to the spirit of this motion before the house, but I am opposed to the form. I believe we ought to eliminate that word "trade" and I am going to move to strike out the word "trade" and insert "industrial union representing his trade."

DEL. McINTOSH: Nonsense.

DEL. PARKS: "Industrial union representing his trade." Now, it seems to me that the opposition in the A. F. of L. will "knock" the idea of craft unions and trade unions under the banner of the I. W. W. I believe this does not traverse in any way the aims of the Committee on Constitution. I think it will be more in line with the aims and objects of this organization to state specifically that when there is an industrial union organized representing a man's trade he should take

his withdrawal card from the mixed local and go into the organization representing his line of work as per the industry. Therefore I move that amendment.

DEL. KLEESE: I would like to have that section read again. I am not perfectly satisfied with it, and not exactly with the spirit, because it would work a little wrong in Portland, where the financial secretary of a mixed local is working in one of the mills, and if that were to carry he would have to leave that and join the mill workers' local, and we being small in numbers it would leave us without a financial secretary.

(Del. Kinneally again read the amendment.)

DEL. MCINTOSH: Mr. Chairman, I object to the wording of that somewhat, and instead of the word "trade" I would want to substitute the word "industry." It seems to me it would be much better. I do not know whether there will be any objections on the part of the Constitution Committee, but I think the wording would be far better to substitute the word "industry."

DEL. McKINNON: In the building trades industry, say a man is in a mixed local in New York, for instance, he belongs to the carpenters and so forth and so on; that man can be in a mixed local. If his trade is organized, at least if his calling is organized say as a steamfitter, he must leave the mixed local and join the steamfitters' local; whereas, otherwise he could hold a card in the steamfitters' or carpenters' or line workers', electricians', and so forth, and has five or six cards. That is what the Constitution Committee would overcome, and make him a member with one card and no more.

DEL. KINNEALLY: The matter is simple enough. An industry is organized, or an industrial union is organized composed of several crafts or trades. I work at painting in the building line, say, and I belong to a mixed local. If this article is adopted and in the building trades a painters' local is organized, I would be compelled, working at my trade as a painter in the building line, to sever my connection with the mixed local and join that local which my trade was attached to and to which I belonged as a painter in the building line. The "trade" is simply a word that means that you join the industry that that trade is attached to. That is the way I looked at it.

DEL. KLEESE: I want to withdraw my objection.

DEL. LUNDY: I am in favor of this amendment, for the simple reason that at Youngstown about a month ago they had a mixed local. A tinnerns' and slaters' local was organized. There were two or three tinnerns and slaters that belonged to the mixed local before the tinnerns and slaters were organized. When the tinnerns and slaters were organized these men did not withdraw from the mixed local, but as I understand continued in the mixed local. Well, they had considerable trouble in the organization in Youngstown. I was organizing through there several times since last May. Now, it was just about a month ago that two men there when the tinnerns and slaters were out on strike charged that the organization was not being run right, the mixed local, and they said they were going to go up to the mixed local and were going to go in and run it, and the president of the organization apparently seemed to be having too much authority, and they went to the mixed local where they should not have been allowed only as members at large and not allowed a vote, and they got the floor and insisted on voting until they broke up the meeting. There is where I claim that they should not be allowed to belong to a mixed local when there is a local of their own trade.

DEL. HAVER: A point of information. I am not exactly clear on this mixed local business. I would like to know what you consider a mixed local. Do you consider a mixed local to include the different branches of a trade, for instance, a silk worker and a silk ribbon weaver? When we organized we organized everybody in the business, girls, women and men; they all belong to different parts of the business, but they are not considered trades; they simply work in the factories at wages from \$2.00 a day up. I would like to know whether you consider that a mixed local?

THE CHAIRMAN: That would be a mixed local.

DEL. PINKERTON: Mr. Chairman and delegates, I concur in the part of the constitution that is presented to you by the Constitution Committee. The bitter experiences in the past in connection with mixed organizations with which I have been affiliated have demonstrated to me that the only possible plan to eliminate the question of jurisdiction among the workers is to classify them for the purpose of grievances and everything of that character, according to their respective trades. I hold in my hand a document signed by P. H. Martin of the Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen. That document, which I happened to have in my pocket, treats on the very same subject that is now before this convention for discussion. Inside of the ranks of that organization we have brakemen, switchmen, conductors, baggagemen and others. For the purpose of administration there is no one allowed out of the entire organization to conduct the affairs of the others. The result is that if a switchman is elected to this position, or if a conductor is elected to that position, he is immediately looked upon by the other crafts or the other trades that are a part of this organization, as being in a false position. The only solution to the question among the railways of North America was the exact solution that has been presented here, that we should have an industrial organization of all of the railway workers, and that each class should be allowed to legislate for itself to a certain point without dictation or interference from the others, and we can not do that if the mixed local is established under the Industrial Workers of the World any more than we could in the contention that arose in 1900 within the ranks of the Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen.

DEL. SCHWEINBURG: Mr. Chairman and fellow delegates, as I understood the motion it is that a member belonging to a mixed local shall leave that local, and if there is a local organized in his trade he shall join the local of his trade. I am in favor of the amendment of Bro. Parks to insert "industrial union of his trade," and I will state why. For instance, in the building industry in New York or anywhere else in the country, if there are members that belong to a mixed local and an industrial union is formed directly for the building trades, that man would have to join the building trades local and not stay any longer in the mixed local. The reason is because the building trade is organized. If there are enough members in the building trades local organized to separate them in their different trades, then certainly the men ought to sever their connection with the mixed local and join the local of their own trade. For that reason I am for the insertion of the words "industrial union of his trade," as Bro. Parks has suggested.

THE CHAIRMAN: Del. Parks made a motion which has just now been seconded by Bro. Schweinburg. There was no second before, consequently the Chair will rule that Bro. Parks' motion was not before the house, and your second is not in order.

DEL. TULLAR: I am opposed to that wording for another reason, and from somewhat the same view, but from a different standpoint. I



am a machinist. I may be employed in a railroad shop; I may be employed in a manufacturing shop. As an employe of a railroad company I would belong to the Transportation Department. As an employe of a manufacturing shop I believe I would belong to the Metal and Machinery industry. Hence that wording there would put me in a queer predicament, would it not? It certainly would.

DEL. HALL: I believe that the purpose of the committee was the same as the purpose of the amendment. I think they both mean the same thing. But I think the committee has been unfortunate in the wording, and I am in favor of adding the word "industrial" in order that the word "trade" may not be misinterpreted. As has been stated, there is a possibility of a misinterpretation of the word "trade" unless it is qualified by the word "industry." If you put the word "industry" in it it means that a local formed within an industry may embrace all trades within that industry. If you leave out the word "industrial" it can be interpreted to mean that in case of the building trades the carpenters may organize a separate local. It may be considered as authority for organizing a separate craft local. Now, we don't want to leave any possible or plausible ground on which a craft local can be organized. If you do that it opens the way for innumerable abuses. If one trade wants a local and it is granted a local on this basis, all trades will be demanding the same thing. Now, I do not think that was the intention of the committee. I think they have simply been unfortunate in the wording of the resolution. Therefore I am in favor of "industrial" appearing in some way which would qualify that term and make it impossible to interpret it in any other way.

DEL. AUGUSTINE: Mr. Chairman, the whole question relative to the name or word "trade" is the contention of the delegates who have taken the floor previously. I take the floor on the same contention. That word "trade" in there would give some an opportunity to say that we were organized on craft lines, and I think that by offering the proper amendment you can clear this matter. I therefore move that we strike out the word "trade" and insert in its place "branch of an industry."

(Seconded by Del. McIntosh.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been regularly moved and seconded that the word "trade" be stricken out and the words "branch of an industry" be inserted. You have heard the amendment. Are you ready for the question?

DEL. DUNCAN: I just want to ask a question as to what is before the house. Was Bro. Parks' amendment in order or was it stricken out?

THE CHAIRMAN: It was not seconded at the time it was made; there was no second offered to it.

DEL. DUNCAN: Then was it before the house?

THE CHAIRMAN: It never was before the house.

THE CHAIRMAN: It never was before the house.

DEL. DUNCAN: Well, then, I move you as an amendment to the amendment that we insert the word "industrial" before the word "union" or "local" in that line that has been read. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved as an amendment to the amendment that the word "industrial" be submitted or inserted before the word "local."

DEL. DUNCAN: Or "union," either one.

THE CHAIRMAN: Or "union." You have heard this amendment; what is your pleasure?

DEL. MOSKOWITZ: Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment of Bro. Duncan is not as clear as the amendment of Comrade Augustine. The

amendment of Comrade Augustine fills the place exactly. It says "branch of an industry." Now, in that way we will be clear upon that proposition. When we speak of an industry we mean, to take for example, the building industry.

DEL. McINTOSH: That is it.

DEL. MOSKOWITZ: In the building industry we may have a hundred branches. Now, the amendment of Bro. Augustine puts that whole thing as it is at the present time, and the amendment to the amendment made by Comrade Duncan puts us in the same position we were in before, when this committee brought in this resolution. So I hope that the delegates will vote for the amendment of Comrade Augustine because it is the clearest, to my conception, and I think to all of the delegates here.

DEL. DUNCAN: Bro. Chairman, my objection to the word "branch" is that it is used with other meanings attached at other times. We talk about a branch of the Mining Department, the metalliferous branch of the Mining Department, the bituminous branch of the Mining Department. In this case we do not mean hardly that. We mean a union in which men of a given trade are aggregated. It would hardly be proper, I think, to designate them by the word "branch" if we were going to use it with another signification in the constitution. And I might say that I meant to include in that amendment which I made, and I think my second will accept it, the words "of his trade." "Industrial union of his trade," as was originally suggested by Bro. Parks.

DEL. FRENCH: There cannot be an industrial union of a trade.

Del. Richter called for the question.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question? (Question). The secretary will call the roll.

DEL. KLEESE: I would like to have it read as amended before the roll is called.

DEL. KINNEALLY: According to the amendment—the other part I could not get because there is so much of it—with Augustine's amendment it would read that we had a trade and it was organized; now, Augustine's amendment means, if I understand it right, to insert the words "of an industry."

DEL. AUGUSTINE: "Branch."

DEL. KINNEALLY: "Of a branch."

DEL. AUGUSTINE: "Branch of an industry."

DEL. KINNEALLY: "Branch of an industry." Strike out the word "trade."

DEL. McINTOSH: Yes, strike out the word "trade."

DEL. KINNEALLY: Well, "branch of an industry." Then down below where it says the same, "after his trade has been organized," we may have "trade" to read "industry."

DEL. MOSKOWITZ: After "branch of industry."

DEL. DE LEON: I would suggest reading the whole amendment so that we may know what it is.

DEL. DUNCAN: I rise to a point of order. This reading is not the amendment before the house. The amendment to the amendment is before the house.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is what is before the house, but the secretary has not got it.

DEL. MAHONEY: I would like to ask what section of the constitution is being amended. I didn't hear it read.

DEL. KINNEALLY: It is a new clause, a new article.

DEL. MAHONEY: A new article?

DEL. KINNEALLY: A new article.

DEL. MAHONEY: Could I hear that read?

DEL. KINNEALLY: I didn't get Comrade Duncan's amendment.

DEL. DUNCAN: To insert the word "industrial" before the words "local or union," that is, before the words "local" or "union," as the case may be.

DEL. KINNEALLY: Insert the word "industrial" before the word "local" or "union."

DEL. DUNCAN: Where they occur in that.

DEL. KINNEALLY: Yes.

DEL. DUNCAN: Also after the words "of his trade."

DEL. FRENCH: I would rise to a point of order on that amendment to the amendment. Owing to the fact that the word "trade" is understood to mean a portion of an industry, a craft, to say "industrial union of his trade" is absolutely an impossible term, and therefore could not apply there at all.

DEL. FOX: That is a fact.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair will rule your point of order is not well taken.

DEL. KINNEALLY: Bro. Duncan amends something that don't exist here. We have no word "local" here. That amendment is inserted before "local." The word "local" is not here.

DEL. DUNCAN: May I ask the question then if you have the expression "trade union" in the resolution.

DEL. KINNEALLY: No, simply the word "trade."

THE CHAIRMAN: Bro. Duncan, if you will allow the Chair, the clause as brought in by the Constitution Committee means just exactly what it says. The constitution says that we are going to organize industrial unions. We cannot organize anything else. That is what we are organizing, and this clause specifies that where a particular trade of an industry is organized all who are working in that industry and who are in a mixed local will have to go into that particular industry, in the local union handling that division. So that is practically exactly what the amendment to the amendment means.

DEL. DUNCAN: May we have it read again?

DEL. KINNEALLY: As originally presented?

DEL. DUNCAN: Yes.

DEL. KINNEALLY: "No member of a trade which is organized in his locality is qualified for admission in a mixed local in the same locality, and no member of a mixed local can remain a member of the same after his trade has been organized in that locality." That is as originally presented.

THE CHAIRMAN: We are not organizing anything but industrial unions.

DEL. DUNCAN: As that draft reads I believe it is satisfactory to me. I had been led to suppose that there was something in there that I find not there, and with the consent of my second I would withdraw the amendment.

DEL. HALL: As the seconder of the amendment I would like to ask for a little information. According to the Chair's interpretation of that section a local that is organized in the building trades is treated there as a mixed local, is it not?

DEL. MOSKOWITZ: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: You cannot organize a mixed local in the building trades.

DEL. HALL: Then the proposition does not refer to a local of carpenters. Then suppose a man belonged to a local of the building trades in New York City and there was a branch organization of carpenters it

does not give permission to organize a branch of carpenters, does it, that is of that trade known generally as the carpenters' trade? It does not permit a local of that kind, does it, a branch of that kind?

DEL. KINNEALLY: I would answer a branch of the carpenters belongs to the industrial organization of the building trades or local.

DEL. HALL: For instance, a painter that belongs to the building trades could belong to that carpenters' local, too.

DEL. KINNEALLY: Not to the carpenters' local, no. He would belong to the building trade, to his own branch; he would belong to the branch of the building trades' local.

DEL. HALL: That is the point I was trying to bring out. Now, Bro. Duncan misunderstood it or he would not withdraw his amendment, for the reason that the local in the building trades cannot be considered a mixed local. And when all the carpenters have organized a branch then all the carpenters that belong to the building trades must withdraw from the carpenters' local. Whether that is the intent or not does not matter, but that is the interpretation that can be put upon it. Now, the amendment that was offered by Duncan is absolutely necessary to this proposition, for the reason that it distinctly disapproves of the organizing of a craft local. It would permit the organizing of a craft local in the building trade or another industry, whether chartered directly by the organization or chartered by any central council. It would permit that committee to bring in a principle into our organization that should not be encouraged, and that is the principle of division. Now, whether it is an actual division, or whether it is simply a division in influence upon the educational development of the member, it has the same primary effect. That is, I take it is admitted, that form has a great deal to do with the educational development of a man, the forms under which he lives, under which we live, the influences under which we live. Therefore if we establish a carpenters' local, although it may be a sub-charter in the building trades, it immediately influences that individual to believe that he is a carpenter; he is not a member of the general calling, but he is a carpenter, for his trade is recognized. Now, we must not recognize trades only so far as it is absolutely necessary for us to recognize them. And I claim this, that that is an unnecessary way to recognize a trade. Now, as to the mixed local; what I would consider a mixed local is a man of the building trades, a man of the Transportation Department, a man of the Metal Working Department, and men of the different departments making up a mixed local for educational and recruiting purposes. Now, that kind of a local your section would apply to, but I say it gives the privilege for the carpenter or the electrical worker or the painter to withdraw from the mixed local or from the local of the building trades and form a local of his own. That is what I wish to avoid. That is what the amendment will avoid, and I claim it is absolutely necessary. Now, if you will insert the word "industrial" in your clause there—it simply needs to be inserted one time—so as to give this sense, that where there is a mixed local, one of these recruiting locals, and afterwards the building trades organize, say in New York, it is necessary for the carpenters, painters, electrical workers, paper hangers and people of that kind to withdraw from the mixed local and go into the building trades local; it seems to me that is the sense that we should give this, and should not permit this resolution to be formed in such a way that it would seem to license the idea that a trade within itself is chartered under this organization or countenanced under this organization. Now, I do not believe the original report of

the committee puts it in that light, and that conveys a different sense altogether.

DEL. McCUE: Mr. President, I believe it is the intent of the Committee on Constitution to convey this impression: that if a man be a member of a mixed local union and then there is an industry in that town or city organized as a whole, then he shall proceed to withdraw from the local mixed union and shall join that branch of the industry which includes his trade, and while it may not appear explicitly stated in the proposed amendment to the constitution, I do wish that it might be so stated there. I don't think it conveys the impression as explicitly as is needed.

DEL. ROGERS: I would like to bring this proposition down to an application of facts. In the vicinity where I live the carpenters are organized. We have got a mixed local, and then the mill men are organized. Well, I work in a building trade sometimes, in the building department in the factory. As a matter of fact, whether the building trade is organized or not, there is where I have to go to get my bread and butter sometimes. Sometimes I am millwrighting in the saw mills. Now, I am a member of the carpenters' branch of the carpenters' trade which is formed out of a mixed local, but at the same time I may be working as a millwright in a saw mill, which is a branch of the carpenters' trade. When that industrial department comes out on strike and I am a member of the carpenters' union, where would I get my benefit from? Would it come from the industrial union of the saw-mill men, or would it come from the carpenters' trade? If I paid my dues to the carpenters' trade and got strike benefits from the saw-mill industry when I went out on strike, I want some member of this committee to explain to me how that rule is going to be applied to the every day facts of life. When I came into the Industrial Workers of the World I took it as an actual fact that it was going to come down to a working basis. We are not confronted with theory, but facts, and I want to hear the proposition explained.

DEL. DUNCAN: I would suggest, it is not necessary to offer it as a motion, I believe the committee would accept it in this way: That it would read that no member of any calling shall be eligible to a mixed local in any locality where his industry is organized, and no member shall be allowed to remain in a mixed local when his industry has been organized into an industrial union.

A DELEGATE: "Local."

DEL. MOSKOWITZ: Read it as amended.

DEL. KINNEALLY: Before I read it I wish to state as a member of the committee that Comrade Hall has placed a wrong construction on "mixed local." As I understand a mixed local it is a recruiting agency for us and it is composed of men who work at a calling and a trade or an industry that is not touched by a trade or an industrial organization as you may call it. That is a mixed local. Now, we have had an illustration in New York. My local had at one time 100 and some odd members. We went down to 50 or 45. Why? Members belonging to our mixed local withdrew and became organized in separate locals. We went down to 25, and we are now down to 18, and there is another local there that I believe is represented on this floor, and I believe it has 5 members, and if this article becomes a law that mixed local will go out of existence, because two or three members work as clerks, and there is a clerks' organization, a trade organization, existing in New York. Now, if we are in such a position in the mixed local that we formerly belonged to, if we are in that position, the mixed local will go out of existence and the day will come when we will have no

mixed locals and all the trades will be organized. But it is not true, as Comrade Hall says, if there is a local or organization composed of switchmen, clerks, trainmen, engineers and firemen working at the transportation industry, all organized together, that it would be a mixed local. Nothing of the kind. It would be an industrial local of Transportation Department workers, not a mixed local. Understand me, a mixed local is composed of trade-men when there is no trade or industrial organization for them; they are a mixed local. You want me to read it as we presented it?

DEL. MOSKOWITZ: As amended.

DEL. KINNEALLY: I didn't get that amendment to the amendment. That is too long for me to get.

DEL. MOSKOWITZ: The amendment of Augustine.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is not before the house. The Chair will rule that the amendment is not before the house. It is Duncan's amendment to the amendment.

DEL. KINNEALLY: Let me have it. Put it in writing.

THE CHAIRMAN: Bro. Hall has not given his consent to the withdrawal. The house has not got its consent, so that in fact it is not withdrawn.

DEL. KINNEALLY: Write your amendment; I want to read it.

DEL. DUNCAN: As a point of personal privilege I will say that I am placed in a rather inconsistent position here in being requested to write out this amendment to the amendment, because when I offered the amendment to the amendment I supposed that there were certain words in that resolution, the word "local" or "union," and on the second reading of it I find that those words are not there. Now my amendment to the amendment proposes to insert the word "industrial" before those words in order to avoid anything that would savor of a recognition of craft unionism. Now, Bro. Hall, of course, has a right to keep this motion before the house, but if he does I believe the wording of it will have to be changed from the wording that I originally gave it, and as Bro. Hall knows his own intention better than I do I would prefer, since he wants to keep it before the house, that he become the maker of the motion and write it.

DEL. HALL: Since Bro. Duncan has withdrawn his motion I will withdraw my second and second the motion of this brother here that made the substitute. Was that offered as a substitute?

DEL. MOSKOWITZ: Yes, I offered it as a substitute.

DEL. HALL: I would second the substitute offered by this brother.

THE CHAIRMAN: If there is no objection on the part of any delegate the amendment to the amendment will be allowed to be withdrawn and the following substitute is offered:

DEL. KINNEALLY: The amendment to the amendment would read—I haven't got it inserted into the original article—"No member of any calling shall be eligible to membership in a mixed local in any locality where his industry is organized, and no member shall be allowed to remain in a mixed local whose industry has been organized into an industrial union." That practically takes the place of the original article.

DEL. DUNCAN: It is a substitute motion.

DEL. KINNEALLY: It is a substitute.

DEL. DUNCAN: Yes.

DEL. KINNEALLY: That practically covers the whole point.

DEL. DUNCAN: Yes, it covers the whole business.

DEL. KINNEALLY: The committee on style will probably re-

arrange the words where it is not correct. I take it as covering practically the whole ground.

DEL. COX: My understanding of this substitute is that it aims to do away with mixed locals; that is, that it will do away with mixed locals. I am not in favor of doing away with mixed locals, for mixed locals are organized in the first place as recruiting locals. After a while, however, when the entire working class are organized, that is, when the industries are all represented, of course we have no necessity then for mixed locals. But until such time I claim we do have a need for mixed locals. Now, if you will permit me, I am not going to offer anything only a suggestion which, prior to the substitute being offered, I had written out. I am just going to read it for the benefit that can be done and will be done, arranging it so as not to eliminate the mixed locals. Here is what I have, in addition to this paragraph, the first clause of the original amendment: "When an industrial union is organized in any locality, should there be any members in a mixed union in that locality properly belonging to that industry, they shall be transferred to the industrial union." I claim that this wording is better than the substitute and that it don't do away with the mixed local.

DEL. KINNEALLY: Let me make this straight. Neither the substitute nor the original article does away with the mixed local. Understand, neither one nor the other does away with the mixed local.

A DELEGATE: There is no mixed local.

DEL. KINNEALLY: There is no doing away with the mixed local as long as there is necessity for the mixed local to exist.

DEL. COX: What I have heard, if you will permit me, of the argument on the floor seems unanimous in wanting to eliminate that word "trade," and I claim this wording that I have here eliminates the word "trade" altogether and conveys the meaning entirely.

DEL. FRENCH: Mr. Chairman, there has been a good deal of discussion here. I might state in starting that I am satisfied with the substitute. Though I did not like the sound of the word "trade," as originally worded, when I heard it read the second time I was satisfied with it, but the wording of the substitute seems to fit the case better. But the debate that has been brought out through a misconception of what an industrial union or a mixed union is, seems to me to need some more clearing up for the benefit of those who seem to think this is what we really want in the matter of forms, as Brother Hall referred to. Now, I was thinking that by this time we would have this understood. At least it is up to us now to say just what we mean by this term that we use, and we want a good chance to make that clear. For the last couple of days I have had an instruction here that has not been read yet, a copy of this that I have got in my hand. My purpose was to follow out the instruction of my constituents, to have this presented to the Constitution Committee, but it has not got into their hands, and they have practically covered the ground already, for the purpose of making more definite the distinction between industrial union, local union, recruiting union, department, and so on. Now, in this are the words "local recruiting or mixed unions shall be composed of wage workers in whose respective industries in a given locality there does not exist during a given time a local industrial union." That is a different word, but I take it that it has the same sense as both the substitute and the original proposition, that a local recruiting union or mixed local shall be composed like a local in the Bronx, of members who are not organized in that industry, in that locality, for the purpose of recruiting, and their work is done like it is in the Bronx, where the local unions are large; it is there for that purpose, and will carry out its purpose. It will consist of and include the one industry

until enough recruits are brought into that union to spread out and form another. The Bronx unions have done that in three cases, first with the piano workers, then the electrical workers, and now the railroad men. A local industrial union is formed in this way: It shall be composed of all wage workers in a given locality—

THE CHAIRMAN: If you will allow the Chair, we are not discussing local unions.

DEL. FRENCH: The reason I want to talk on that line is that I saw the discussion was all around this question; that people stood up and spoke of a local union as being something that it is not, and I wanted to try to clear it up because this is a good place to clear it up; and if the Chair will permit me I would like to say a few more words along that line.

THE CHAIRMAN: I would like to have you confine yourself to the subject.

DEL. FRENCH: The immediate subject is this, that the substitute as it has been presented by Duncan defines or leaves room for defining this recruiting union just as I have been defining it, and also places the members of the recruiting union who have no business in that recruiting union—places them in the industry to which they belong as organized. It places them in the industry in which they are organized; that is the point. But on account of bringing in a misconception of what an industrial union is and referring to an industrial union as a mixed union, which it is not, it refers to a recruiting union as something which it is not. That is why I was going off in that fashion, so that if I cannot explain what our conception of an industrial union is, then I will have to close down. I approve the substitute because it carries out my ideas as far as it goes.

DEL. KLEESE: I would like to say, Brother Chairman and fellow delegates, that I am opposed to both the substitute and the original motion in so far as they destroy the recruiting or mixed union. Now, I have got my own mind. The brother secretary of the Constitution Committee stated that his union had a membership something like 70, didn't you?

DEL. KINNEALLY: At one time.

DEL. KLEESE: Then a union was formed in some industry and cut it down to 30. Then another union was formed and cut it down to 18. Now another union may be formed and cut it down to three or four. Then if you have the cigarmakers in the city to be organized, or the railroaders, you will have to initiate some new fellows before you can have a mixed local, and the new blood will have to be the recruiting blood. I am in favor of the spirit of the motion to get the men into the industrial unions where they belong, but if it will destroy their recruiting local I will have to oppose it. I think there should be some provision in there to allow enough members to remain in the recruiting local to carry on the work of that local.

DEL. HOLMES: I fail to see how this can destroy the mixed locals. I am in a local union where we organized local trades and the men went from the mixed local into that particular department, but is there any particular reason why we should not keep on recruiting and doing some propaganda and getting other men in the mixed local? The mixed local is merely a recruiting station, as has been very properly stated. You propose to recruit from that, as soon as there is enough of one particular line of work to start a local of that line or that industry. That is all a mixed local is for, and not to keep up as a mere propaganda organization with the hope that none of your members will go into anything else.



DEL. JOHNSON; Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the central point in this discussion is transferring members from the mixed local into their respective industrial organizations. Now then, that presupposes that there is a mixed local, and that as soon as there is that department or that branch or craft, or whatever it may be designated, in that respective industrial union, they shall be transferred from the mixed local into that branch. The object of this is to prevent a member of a mixed local retaining his membership there and going over into his respective craft. That is the object and that is the central point in connection with this discussion. Now, the question arises in connection with this discussion as to whether the word "craft" should be used in that connection.

A DELEGATE: "Trade."

DEL. JOHNSON: Yes, rather the word "trade." Now then, it seems to me that it is safe to use that in this connection. It seems to me that if we use the word "industrial" in place of "trade," that confuses it, because we must in the end be able to designate the particular branch of the industrial union.

DEL. DUNCAN: Mr. President, I would like to explain my amendment. In so far as abolishing the mixed locals is concerned, as has just been stated, the mere fact that provision has been made for the mixed local presupposes that we do not propose to abolish the mixed local. But here and there, as has been shown, it may have the effect of temporarily abolishing the mixed local. Well, what of it? The mixed local is not to be a permanent institution in the I. W. W. It is merely the propaganda that will build up an industrial union for the future. It is a recruiting station. If there is not enough members left to retain the charter let them give up their charter for the time being, for they can still carry on the propaganda work, and I have no doubt whatever but what they will have the assistance of that particular locality where they are engaged in the work of propaganda. Now, in so far as the definition of industrial unionism is applied to this particular section, from my point of view, Mr. Chairman, for instance, in the small localities in the building trades, as has been stated, if a local of the building trades is organized, when the first attempt is made, of course there is only a few, perhaps ten or twenty, according to the size of the town, or perhaps fifty or a hundred that are organized in that particular local. But since the building trades have so many diversified callings—bricklayers, metal workers, carpenters, etc.—while it may seem not in harmony with the views of some to put them in the broad local, yet I believe that is what industrial unionism stands for, to put all these men into one local in such localities where the conditions are favorable for such a course. If you take it in a city like New York, where 10,000, or perhaps 25,000 men are engaged in the building trades, it would be impossible to put them all in one local, and hence it is justifiable to split them up into branches—not for the purpose of recognizing their different crafts or creating any distinctions or any aristocracy of labor. No, they are merely to be divided and subdivided into so many branches for the facilitation of the business of the organization, and for no other purpose. In a small locality, where perhaps the whole local union at one time may be engaged in the construction of one particular building, what more perfect form of industrial unionism can possibly be imagined than to have all those that are engaged on the one particular building in one local union? Because if they have any grievance they all can come together and they can discuss it among themselves. Of course the carpenter may have his views and the bricklayer may have his views, but there is no

division of interest. Their interests are all identical. Why split hairs upon this proposition?

(Question called for.)

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair is of the opinion that you could take a vote right now without any further talk, and I want to see it done. The secretary will call the roll.

A DELEGATE: What is the substitute?

DEL. KINNEALLY: I will read the language: "No member of any calling shall be eligible to a mixed local in any locality where his industry is organized, and no member shall be allowed to remain in a mixed local whose industry has been organized into an industrial union."

THE CHAIRMAN: The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called as far as Delegate Brown.

DEL. BROWN: Before I vote on that I would like to ask a question. In my district I belong to a mixed local, the carpenters and joiners there. Would a man have to make application to join this local of carpenters and joiners instead of joining our local? That is according to the Federation of Labor idea. That is the reason I ask.

A DELEGATE: Certainly not.

THE CHAIRMAN: Proceed with the roll.

The roll call was resumed and finished.

DEL. PARKS: I want to raise a point of order. It is altogether improper for the secretary to call the name of Kirkpatrick. That is my point of order. I think we ought to establish that so that it may be stricken from the roll. It ought to have been done heretofore.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair will state that your point of order is well taken.

DEL. KIRKPATRICK: Mr. Chairman, I would like to know when action was taken.

THE CHAIRMAN: In the opinion of the Chair, Brother Kirkpatrick, when the constitutional provision was adopted, raising the membership required for a department to 10,000—that was the action—that any and all departments which did not come up to that figure were dissolved, and that any one who sat in this convention as an Executive Board member of that department was deprived or unseated by such action.

DEL. KIRKPATRICK: I would like to state that I have voted since that time and no question was raised.

DEL. McINTOSH: It is raised now.

DEL. KIRKPATRICK: And it seems to me it is improper. The Department of Metal and Machinery today has the stipulated amount and came into this convention with the stipulated amount of per capita tax paid and has the membership. I cannot see how this convention could in any way interfere with the department under those conditions. If it can, there is no reason why it could not have raised it to 50,000 and debar the Mining Department, and there is no reason why at the next convention, when the Metal Department should come in with 10,000, that they should not raise it to 20,000. It seems to me that this convention is going entirely outside of what it is called for when it takes any such position, and I, in that Department of Metal and Machinery, hold and will hold that the Department of Metal and Machinery is still that same department until the membership of that department vote by a referendum to disband it. That money is in there, and I cannot see by what authority you as individual delegates elected from the Mining Department or from any local union affiliated with this Industrial Workers of the World should interfere with the Metal and Machinery Department. Personally you can debar

me from a vote here, but I still carry on the Metal and Machinery Department, and I will send out the proceedings of this convention to the Metal and Machinery Department and ask them what their deliberations are on the same, before I will take any cognizance of Parks or any other individual delegate on this floor telling me that I have no vote. The same membership that gave me the vote at the last convention has not told me that I could not vote at this convention. The convention may do as it sees fit, but it has never taken a vote to unseat either the Department of Transportation or the Department of Metal and Machinery.

THE CHAIRMAN: Bro. Kirkpatrick, if you will allow, the Chair would say that it is the opinion of the Chair that this point has been settled so far as this convention is concerned, and you will please come to order and not take up the time of the convention. The Secretary will call the roll.

DEL. KIRKPATRICK: I want to appeal from the decision of the Chair.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have that privilege, but the appeal won't be recognized at this time.

DEL. KIRKPATRICK: I presume I may be allowed to sit in the convention and listen to the proceedings of the convention? I am in good standing.

A DELEGATE: Yes, go back in the hall.

The vote was then announced as follows: Total vote, 260; yes, 65; no, 195.

THE CHAIRMAN: The substitute is lost. The vote now occurs on the amendment.

DEL. KINNEALLY: Do you want the original article as read and the amendment?

DEL. MOSKOVITZ: Just the amendment, the article as amended.

DEL. KINNEALLY: In place of the word "trade," the article as amended will read as follows: "No member of a branch of an industry which is organized in his locality is qualified for admission in a mixed local in the same locality, and no member of a mixed local can remain a member of the same after his branch of industry has been organized in that locality." Is that correct?

DEL. MOSKOVITZ: That is correct.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Secretary will call the roll.

DEL. MARKLEY: There is no objection to the same roll call standing for this vote.

DEL. TULLAR: **Make it unanimous.**

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair desires to be recorded against the amendment, so far as he is concerned, if there is nobody else.

A DELEGATE: I wish to be recorded against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN: Call the roll.

The roll call was taken and completed.

DEL. CRONIN: May I ask a question while the Secretary is counting the vote?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

DEL. CRONIN: I desire to ask a question. We have practically disqualified the Department of Metal and Machinery. Isn't that true?

THE CHAIRMAN: We have disqualified the Department of Metal and Machinery, yes.

DEL. CRONIN: Will you allow Bro. Maichele, I believe his name is, to vote the departmental representation?

THE CHAIRMAN: No.

DEL. CRONIN: What is he voting on?

THE CHAIRMAN: He is voting on the unions in Schenectady, I think.

DEL. CRONIN: He has 36 votes from Schenectady. Is that correct?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

DEL. CRONIN: Then Bro. Jackson, that votes 8 or 10 votes, votes what?

THE CHAIRMAN: How is that?

DEL. CRONIN: The votes from Schenectady or some place down there. It is a great country; I don't know where it is.

THE CHAIRMAN: Jackson?

DEL. CRONIN: Yes. If he is disqualified I just want to know, that is all. I want to know whether it would be proper, according to the opinion of the convention.

THE CHAIRMAN: That was the opinion of the Chair.

DEL. PARKS: I rise to a point of order, to clear it up. The point of order is this, that Mr. Maichele was seated here to vote all of the votes of the Transportation Department that were not represented—  
(An interruption.)

DEL. PARKS: Wait till I get through—of the Metal and Machinery Department, those two men—wherein the locals were not represented by members in the locals. Jackson was elected by some local. Maichele said he understood he was elected by 21 locals in his vicinity. Now, the report of the Credentials Committee allotted to the various delegates of the M. and M. Department coming from locals, the vote of their locals with the remainder of the votes that went to the M. and M. Department. I believe we should refer the matter to the Committee on Credentials and have them report back how many votes Bro. Maichele is entitled to, as the M. and M. Department is not now an organized department, and that will cut down the required vote a few votes, to make it technically correct.

The vote as announced stood: Total vote, 262; yes, 126; no, 136.

THE CHAIRMAN: The amendment is lost. The vote now occurs upon the motion to concur in the committee's recommendation.

DEL. KIRKPATRICK: Mr. Chairman, I want to get some information.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Secretary will call the roll.

DEL. CRONIN: I want to get some information.

THE CHAIRMAN: You can get it as soon as this vote is taken.

DEL. CRONIN: Very well.

By request Del. Kinneally again read the original recommendation of the committee.

DEL. RIORDAN: Mr. Chairman, it says "no man who is a member of a trade," which seems to mean "no member of a union in the Industrial Workers of the World." The question may arise whether or not a member of some other labor organization would not have to make application to this mixed local. Is that point covered?

THE CHAIRMAN: The opinion of the Chair—

DEL. CRONIN: Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question for information?

THE CHAIRMAN: The Secretary will call the roll.

DEL. CRONIN: May I ask a question on the question, not with reference to who is voting? Is it the recommendation of the Committee on Constitution that it is permissible to have craft unions?

THE CHAIRMAN: No. It is a new section of the constitution devised to regulate the membership so that no man can hold membership in two locals of the I. W. W. at the same time.

DEL. CRONIN: But it says "craft."

THE CHAIRMAN: It does not say "craft." It says "trade."

DEL. McINTOSH: It says "trade."

DEL. CRONIN: Why doesn't it say "industry?"

THE CHAIRMAN: Because a trade is not an industry. A trade is simply a branch of an industry.

DEL. CRONIN: You have trade unions in this branch.

THE CHAIRMAN: No, it does not say "trade union."

The roll was called about one-third through, to the name of Del. Haver.

DEL. HAVER: I would just like to ask a question for information. Would that have anything to do with musicians? Would that take in a musician that belonged to a union?

A DELEGATE: That is not what it means.

THE CHAIRMAN: In the opinion of the Chair it does.

DEL. HAVER: That that man should belong to the local?

THE CHAIRMAN: He could not belong to two.

DEL. HAVER: Then I don't vote.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll call was then finished.

DEL. KOHL: A point of information, as to the railroad men. By the report of the Constitution Committee, would the railroad men have to divide into departments the same as they are now?

THE CHAIRMAN: How is that?

DEL. KOHL: As to the railroad men, for instance engineers, firemen, brakemen, switchmen, car repairers and so on down, does that divide the department?

THE CHAIRMAN: Would it divide the Transportation Department?

DEL. KOHL: Yes, those that are in the Transportation Department.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would it divide them up into locals of engineers and so on?

DEL. KOHL: Yes, sir. The way I understood that vote, it would divide them up into the different locals or unions.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair would say that in the railroad department, as in all other industries, it would permit the men who work as engineers, firemen and wipers, to have a local of their own under the one charter and the one industrial union—a branch local in the one industrial union. That is all it would permit. It would not divide them at all.

The vote was announced, as follows: Total vote, 255; yes, 242; no, 13.

THE CHAIRMAN: The amendment is adopted.

#### THE KIRKPATRICK CASE.

DEL. KIRKPATRICK: Mr. Chairman, I believe that in all fairness to the convention, this matter ought to be put on record. I would like to have it appear in the stenographic report that this is the first time my name has not been called on the roll, and that the Chair rules that I have no vote. I appeal from the decision of the Chair.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, the Chair would so rule.

DEL. KIRKPATRICK: I appeal from the decision of the Chair.

DEL. DESMOND: A point of order. The decision of the Chair is the decision of this body.

DEL. KIRKPATRICK: I don't care what the decision is; I appeal from it. This is the first time that I have been deprived of a vote. There has been no vote taken on it, and it is simply gag rule.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair will state that in his opinion we need a little gag rule, as we have had a little bit too much of gab rule. (Applause.) We want to do business. If we can't do business only

by gag rule, we will have gag rule. (Applause.) The Secretary will proceed.

DEL. KIRKPATRICK: Do you rule that I have been guilty of gag rule or too much gab?

THE CHAIRMAN: The Secretary will proceed.

DEL. CRONIN: Bro. St. John, I ask you to decide a question. I asked you a question which you told me you would decide after the vote on the motion to amend the constitution should be taken.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

DEL. CRONIN: And that was, if the Metal and Machinery Department was dissolved was Bro. Maichele entitled to 36 votes as being elected as a delegate to represent the Metal and Machinery Department? I want your answer, Mr. Chairman, that is all. I don't want to stop your work.

THE CHAIRMAN: I understand they are entitled to that, and the Chair will try to explain it. It is the understanding of the Chair that when the motion to seat the delegates representing the locals of what was formerly the M. and M. Department was up here, that it was to this effect: that these delegates, mentioning their names, be seated with the vote which their respective locals were entitled to according to the per capita tax paid, and that Bro. Maichele be seated as representing the balance of the locals of the department which were not represented here.

DDEL. RICHTER: Correct.

DEL. CRONIN: Just one other point—I don't want to tangle up the proceedings—and that is as to Bro. Jackson. Bro. Maichele represents the locals of Schenectady, N. Y., and Bro. Jackson has left town. He was representing something here. He was not a contestant at the time the contestants against the contestees were before this convention, and I don't understand the status of both of them. That is what I want to have perfectly clear, that is the status of both of them, Bro. Jackson and Bro. Maichele. Bro. Maichele has got the entire vote with the exception of what the contestants received at the hands of this convention, but Bro. Jackson also has a vote that was not received at the hands of this convention because he was not a contestant.

THE CHAIRMAN: Bro. Jackson can probably answer Del. Cronin's question.

DEL. JACKSON: Bro. President and delegates, Bro. Maichele represents the city of Schenectady with the exception of one local, No. 34, numbering 650 members. I represent that local, and Bro. Maichele represents all the rest.

DEL. KIRKPATRICK: Is it not a fact that the Department of Metal and Machinery—

DELEGATES: Out of order.

DEL. KIRKPATRICK: I want to state that there are twenty other locals that are not in Schenectady. Who is representing them?

DEL. PARKS: A point of order.

DEL. KIRKPATRICK: Mr. Chairman—

THE CHAIRMAN: Bro. Kirkpatrick, will you please not interrupt the convention any more?

DEL. KIRKPATRICK: I didn't know I was. I was asking for information.

THE CHAIRMAN: If you want information, ask it through somebody that has a voice on this floor.

DEL. HAWKINS: According to the ruling of this convention the Secretary of the convention was instructed to telegraph all locals whose representatives went away from the convention. I would suggest, if there are any locals that Bro. Kirkpatrick is talking about that are not

represented, that they be telegraphed by the Secretary under that other motion.

A DELEGATE: He has already done so.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Secretary of the Constitution Committee will proceed.

#### CONSTITUTION.—MIXED LOCALS.

DEL. HALL: Before you read that, I have a subsidiary motion that I would like to offer.

THE CHAIRMAN: What is your motion?

DEL. HALL: "A mixed local shall be defined as a local whose membership shall consist of workers from two or more industries, and the function of such local shall be to provide an opportunity for the workers to become members of the I. W. W. in localities where their particular industry is not organized." Now, that defines a mixed local, and I consider it necessary in connection with the section which has just been adopted. That is, the committee claims this is the interpretation that we should put upon that section. Now, I want the workers to understand what their interpretation is, and for that reason it seems to me that a definition of the mixed local should be put in this constitution so that there will be no chance of misunderstanding the section. This simply defines a mixed local. It does not take from it or add to it in the least.

DEL. DUNCAN: I move to incorporate Bro. Hall's definition in the constitution. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair is of the opinion that this motion which has been moved and seconded is defining something which, in the opinion of the Chair, is already well understood or should be, and that the motion is out of order.

DEL. PARKS: I rise to a point of order. This delegate makes it impossible for us to hear what is going on. He is right here, and took the floor—

ALT. KIEFF: I was just going to leave. I want to get a point of information, that is all. I want to know what you class as a mixed local.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair will rule your point of information out of order. I don't think we are going to take up the time of this convention discussing what is a mixed local. It has already been decided, in my opinion.

The report of the Committee on Constitution was resumed.

#### CONSTITUTION.—CONVENTION.

DEL. KINNEALLY: Article VI, Convention, Section 1, reads as follows: "The annual convention of the Industrial Workers of the World shall be held on the first Monday in May of each year such place as may be determined by a previous convention." Now, the committee recommends that the words "first Monday in May" be stricken out and the words "third Monday in September" be inserted, so that the article would read: "The annual convention of the Industrial Workers of the World shall be held on the third Monday in September of each year at such place as may be determined by a previous convention."

DEL. COX: I move to concur in the report of the committee. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been regularly moved and seconded that the report of the Committee on Constitution be concurred in, that portion of it which changes the date of the convention from the first

Monday in May to the third Monday in September. You have heard the motion; are you ready for the question? (Question called for.)

A DELEGATE: Unanimous consent.

THE CHAIRMAN: If there are no objections the Chair will rule that it is carried by unanimous consent.

DEL. KLEESE: Is there any debate on that before it is carried?

THE CHAIRMAN: I asked if you were ready for the question, and some one asked for unanimous consent. You may debate it.

DEL. KLEESE: I want to debate the place of holding the convention.

THE CHAIRMAN: That hasn't anything to do with this.

DEL. KLEESE: It is in there.

THE CHAIRMAN: No, it is not.

DEL. KINNEALLY: It only changes the time.

DEL. KLEESE: I am told that that says that the place shall be designated by the convention.

DEL. MARKLEY: Later on.

DEL. KINNEALLY: Later on.

DEL. McINTOSH: The convention will decide that when it comes up.

DEL. KLEESE: I think it would be a good idea to incorporate in there that the convention shall be held in Chicago, where the officers live, and where we would be right near to headquarters, to save this quibbling about having the convention at a little town.

DEL. RYAN: That matter is not covered by the report of the committee at this time. It is understood that in all conventions, after we are through with the order of business, the place of the next convention will be determined.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is it the desire of the delegates that unanimous consent to concurring in this recommendation of the committee be given?

A DELEGATE: Yes.

DEL. KLEESE: Record me as objecting.

THE CHAIRMAN: Bro. Kleeese objects. Otherwise it is carried unanimously.

#### EDUCATION OF RECRUITS.

DEL. KINNEALLY: The Committee on Constitution presents to this body this resolution and wishes it to be the voice of the convention:

"Whereas, The system of organization adopted by the I. W. W. is the industrial system as against the craft system.

"Whereas, Due to the craft training received by the working class, insistence upon the industrial system before accepting into the I. W. W. men who would otherwise be ready to join it, would cause such men to remain outside of the industrial atmosphere; therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the incoming General Executive Board is hereby directed to organize the new recruits in and by industries and to promote the education in industrialism, among those men to whom charters may have to be issued, upon a craft system before they could be enrolled in the I. W. W."

It was moved and seconded to adopt the resolution.

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been regularly moved and seconded that we concur in this. You have heard the motion; are you ready for the question?

At the request of Del. McIntosh the resolution proper was again read.

DEL. MOSKOVITZ: Mr. Chairman, now I would request the com-

23' yes  
10 no



mittee to make this more plain. I don't understand the resolution. The craft business is so much in my line that I have to hear it mentioned.

DEL. DE LEON: Mr. Chairman, the spirit of this proposition has been precluded by the discussion upon the mixed locals, and to a certain extent it has been gone into, quite extensively from the opposite side, by the lengthy address of Sherman when the case of McKinnon was up. The resolution directs the Executive Board to organize the new recruits in and by the industrial system. Sherman held the position in his address, in his recommendation, that that was contrary to the constitution. We claim that his position is contrary to the constitution, and in the concrete case of the building trades industrial union of New York he carried out that which the resolution directs the incoming Executive Board not to do. The facts in the case are—to take that illustration—exactly the reverse of those stated, both by Sherman and Keogh. The men of that industry, the men of that local—we shall call it of that union—who asked for admission, were told of the system of industrial unionism, and several of them who visited me afterwards when they were forced to take a craft charter, stated to me that when this system of industrial unionism was presented to them it was as if a whole lot of candles had been lighted in their heads. They understood that their system of craft organization, or an organization of a trade, of a calling under a separate charter, cultivated the craft system of the A. F. of L., and that although those various crafts would be united in a fashion, the union would be very much of the A. F. of L. style, an affiliation and not an actual unity. Differently from the facts stated by Sherman, the fact remains that those men were willing to organize on the industrial system. They were willing to go in that industrial council; that thereupon, notwithstanding they were so willing, a craft charter was imposed upon them. They asked whether we would keep a man out—as though we were trying to keep men out. We were trying to draw men in, and we condemn by that resolution the action of the former G. E. B., now defunct, and we condemn its action in not only failing to promote industrialism but in doing this when the men were ready to follow on the line of industrialism, in forcing them out of the channel of industrialism and back into the channel of craftism for the sake of chartering them. The argument made by Sherman was that this industrial system will be very good in the future, at some time, but at the present time it was very bad. Let me make an argument to you that I made before the Committee on Constitution. He made two arguments. He said with a fervor that I shall not imitate, because it was so loud, he said that that system of organization was impossible, that the working class would not join it, and in the same breath he said that if that system prevails it will become so numerous and so strong that it will turn itself against the central organization and go it alone. Now, I ask you to examine those two arguments and you will see that one picks the other to pieces. If it is true that you cannot organize the working class of America upon this industrial plan, notwithstanding the object lesson given by capitalism, then it is impossible that there will be any danger of their becoming so strong on the industrial side as to turn their force against us in the central organization. On the other hand, if there were a danger of their becoming so strong were they to be organized on a plan that they could become a source of danger to the G. E. B. by going it alone, then the other argument must be false. It must be false that it is not possible to bring the men in. Our experience is the reverse of what Sherman stated. Our experience is that if you can come directly before the working people, if you can come seriously and earnestly and convince

them that this thing does not need three years for its effective solution, if you can state to them the facts of experience, you will enlighten them, and the class instinct is touched, and that class instinct will always, at least in 999 cases out of a thousand, answer true to itself. So much for the argument that you cannot organize them.

I want to make another point. It was asked the other morning, "How many have you got?" If that question means anything it means that the other style of organization is helpless. In fact, the other style of organization is as important as a new-born babe. The fact is, they have no numbers, and where they have numbers it is a benefit only for the leaders of the organization who can get a lot of money to go to conventions. But the rank and file remain crucified, strapped to the back of the capitalist system. Now as to the other argument, Sherman's position is that if we had succeeded in organizing them on that system they would become so numerically powerful and financially powerful that they would be a danger and would turn against us. That is a wonderful argument. That argument is this: That the correct organization of the working people would make them strong against the capitalists, but would make them also strong against the G. E. B. and that rather than have them strong against the G. E. B. we must hamstring them and make them weak against capitalism also. That is what that argument amounts to. Now, in this resolution we state that the industrial system of organization is a fact born in this convention, in the convention of last year; that it cannot be treated as an adult; it is to be fondled; it is to be taken care of very tenderly. The objection to the G. E. B. is that it promotes that system of industrial organization. In other words, we forbade them to interfere with the work of industrialists and compelled the men who are convinced and have been convinced and have been educated up to that point, to go back into the channels of craftism. And this resolution goes further and says that we recognize that there may be men who are so trained that for the moment they may not want to come in on the industrial system. The committee holds that those men should not be held out and should not be thrown out, but those men should be accepted, because if they are not accepted they will keep away from the industrial atmosphere and we prevent that by bringing those men in and by a system of systematic, constant, persistent, logical education we can bring them over to us and thereby prevent any danger either of this organization being swamped by them or of the industrial organization turning its sword against it. That is all there is in the proposition.

To sum up, the proposition maintains that we act as industrialists; that the Board of Directors are to proceed upon those lines; that its educators and organizers shall organize in that direction and shall do all they can to enlighten the men in that direction, and that the other proposition is wrong and shall not be tolerated. And if in their experience they find that a local does not yet want to come in on that system, let the local be not driven out; let it be taken in and be taken care of, in the meantime educating it the best way we can.

DEL. FRENCH: Do I understand that that is a resolution instructing the General Executive Board, and not a part of the constitution?

DEL. KINNEALLY: No.

DEL. FRENCH: Owing to the fact that we may be misunderstood, both myself and others, if in talking along this line some member, particularly De Leon, may take more time talking than the bunch, I wish to state that I can corroborate what Del. De Leon has said with regard to experience which contradicted the assertions of ex-President Sherman. I wish to speak from the bunch, as one who has had as much

experience as anybody here during the past year, as one of those "wise guys from New York" who has been agitating for years changes of this sort, and I would not dare to go back where I came from and agitate for anything else. I wish to state that I have found in my experience in personal talk with hundreds of working men in New York and in New Jersey that the working class is just in that position that Del. De Leon referred to where our presentation of the industrial system of organization is like the light of a thousand candles, the opening of a new light to them. I was one of those who explained it to McKinnon's organization when we voted unanimously to join 95, and there were groups of men now in the transportation and in the iron industry over there to whom the explanation of this plan was like the lighting of a candle in their brains, so that they want to get together upon this plan and don't want to get together on the craft plan. I find in my experience in working in the different industries where I have been working, that they are ready for it, and for this resolution instructing the General Executive Board to insist upon the industrial system of organization, so that the moment our General Executive Board deviated from that we will know where they are at and where we are at and what we have got to do.

DEL. AUGUSTINE: On this matter I also wish to corroborate what De Leon and French have said about the membership of Building Trades Local 95.

THE CHAIRMAN: Del. Augustine, if you haven't anything to say except in corroboration of the two delegates who have explained, you would make progress in the convention by not talking about that.

DEL. AUGUSTINE: I want to say that certain questions have been brought up here and this is an opportunity to answer them on that line. When the question was asked how many members we have in our local I answered about 40. Now the membership of our local or industrial union was kept down, due to the fact that the general administration stood for craft unionism and that we did not dare to go out and organize on the industrial line, because it was given to one man or we were given to understand that we could not organize on our lines, and that was the reason why our industrial union did not increase its membership. The matter of the structural iron workers was based upon that. That organization was organized by Shurtleff. He came to us and we declined to allow him to organize them on the craft lines proposed. All along we have been attempting to organize upon industrial lines, and we were checked by the general administration. That was the main reason why we did not increase in membership.

DEL. PARKS: Mr. Chairman, I am going to state my position. I will not vote for anything on the floor of this house that I don't understand. A thing that there is no reason for ought not to exist. Now, I am agreeing with the revolutionary element in this convention that the principles of industrialism were trampled in the ground by ex-General President Sherman when he countenanced the issuing of that charter to Daniel McKinnon's local in New York. I believe that Bro. Augustine here when he presented that contest before the Committee of the Whole, properly defined what an industrial union should be, and I believe that my amendment to the motion this afternoon that came before the house, which was not seconded, and therefore did not come properly before the house, but which properly covered the case of Bro. McKinnon, was right in line with the definition which he presented before the Committee of the Whole that morning, and which proposed amendment that we voted on here of Bro. Augustine

had 13 votes for. I believe that that covers the ground and would prevent this action in issuing that local a charter contrary to the principles of our constitution as President Sherman did. Now, you repudiated the amendment which was proposed to the constitution, this report of Bro. Augustine and Bro. Foote this afternoon. You have repudiated that. Now, you have put something else in here to cover this McKinnon case so that such a thing will not arise again. Now, it looks to me like we are simply getting a lot of official records here that are going to bring in more confusion; that is the way it looks to me. Bro. De Leon's statement regarding Sherman's two contradictory attitudes as to the industrial form of unionism was mathematically correct. He is correct there. And I don't see why the Committee on Constitution could not have supported Bro. Augustine's amendment to that first question that he brought in here this afternoon. Now, I want to ask the Committee on Constitution to further enlighten us regarding this resolution which they bring in here, which ought, by the way, I believe, to come in properly from the Resolution Committee. I want to ask them if they do not think that it would be stronger to have an industrial union defined in the constitution in accordance with the definition as laid down by Bro. Augustine the morning he presented the McKinnon contest before the Committee of the Whole, and which was right in line with the amendment that was presented by Bro. McKinnon to the first proposition that we took up here this afternoon, when we came in after adjournment. I ask the Committee on Constitution if that would not be more consistent and add more clearness.

DEL. VEAL: Mr. Chairman and Brother Delegates, this device of power given to the Executive Board in the interpretation of what we understand to be the principles of the Industrial Workers of the World will devolve entirely on the men that you put there to represent the ideas that are promulgated by the Industrial Workers of the World. While speaking in Jersey City with a member of the Industrial Workers of the World—I will mention his name, Shurtleff—he got up on the floor before a body of working men and told those men that the reason why he was opposed to the American Federation of Labor was that that organization did not organize the working class; that though it had been in the field so many years it only reached one million and a half men. Now, the moment that we admit that the American Federation of Labor is an expression of organized labor, then we as members of the Industrial Workers of the World are scabbing on the American Federation of Labor. Hence the concept is wrong to begin with, and the men who understood the principles of industrial unionism, who sat in that audience, you could see them twitching. They recognized the discord the moment it was given. In talking to Del. Keogh, who claims to have a clear record, a man who has stood up for the principles of the Knights of Labor—who claims to have fought the battles of labor in the state of New York—he comes out and tells us that he stands for this principle.

DEL. MOSKOWITZ: Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order.

DEL. VEAL: He says that the Knights of Labor fought the battles of the working class. I say that is another wrong concept, because the Knights of Labor did not recognize the class struggle nor did it stand for the abolition of the wage system. Hence when those ideas are brought into this organization we have a discord every time. The idea of revolutionary economics and the idea of pure and simple—dom are bound to clash, and I say the construction that you give this Executive Board must be the correct construction, and the one that has

been put upon the expression of the Industrial Workers of the World, which has been the reason why in the state of New Jersey, in New York City, and other parts of this country we have had to go on the platform and repudiate many of these statements made by men who claim to understand industrial unionism, when the fact of the case was that it was pure and simple democracy delivered under the banner of the Industrial Workers of the World. And this organization has got to take a stand as to what kind of a procedure we are to follow and the Executive Board which will be selected from the organization will see to that according to the instructions that we give them in this constitution. Hence I stand for that which the comrade has read regarding the Executive Board.

DEL. SHENKAN: Mr. Chairman. I would just like to ask a question of the committee. I would like to know if this resolution is carried would that prevent the Executive Board granting charters over the objections of the local district council or central council? The point that I have reference to is a case that happened right in New York where objections were raised to the chartering of a certain organization and the objections were overruled or rather ignored and the charter was granted without any reasons given by the central body. I would like to have that answered.

DEL. DE LEON: There is no question of the correlation of the power in this G.E.B. This resolution is simply an express direction to the G.E.B. as to what to do. It says they shall endeavor to organize upon industrial lines, and therefore, if it is not possible, you must leave the men out. What happened in New York is a horse of that color. That was a case that could not possibly have happened if there were not a conflicting interpretation of the constitution. This conflicting interpretation is what this organization really had, and as I intimated this morning on the referendum, it is a difference as to whether the child is the thing itself or the slime in which it is born.

DEL. MOSKOWITZ: Mr. Chairman and Delegates, if I understand the resolution right, I would say that we have two systems, the industrial system of organization and the trade system of organization. Now, I say that under such a system, or systems rather, we invite reaction, and we have complained for the last two weeks of what the reactionary element was doing with this organization. So therefore I don't see why we should invite reaction in the future, in the next convention, if we have to sit here four months instead of two or three weeks. Therefore I cannot realize how in the world we would conduct ourselves as to the organization and the two systems. If the one we have got is wrong then the other is right, and if the other is wrong, then the one we have is right. Therefore I can distinguish under the circumstances which one is wrong. If the trade union is wrong, the industrial form of organization is right, and why should we not have that system of organization?

DEL. PARKS: I want to know if it is not presumed we are going to organize an industrial union on the industrial plan? What I want to know is what is an industrial union? Now, wouldn't it be better to make that definition as we tried to a while ago? I ask the Constitution Committee if that is not proper. It is presumable that we are going to organize industrial unions in the I. W. W. My point is that we ought to define what an industrial union is, and that will settle the problem.

DEL. FRENCH: I would like to ask if it is not the sense of the Constitution Committee that an industrial union shall be composed of the wage workers in a given industry in any locality, whether in a

craft or shop branches, but as the particular requirements of the industry may render necessary. Isn't that about the conception of the members of that committee of an industrial union?

THE CHAIRMAN: That is my conception. I do not know about the other members of the committee.

DEL. FRENCH: Likely it is.

DEL. DE LEON: Certainly that is the conception. Now, as to the question of Del. Parks as to whether we ought not to define it. Del. Parks is a lawyer and ought to know something about law, and he should know how hard it is to define fraud, and it is not done, at any rate, because the moment you define it it gives a loophole to get around it. Now, what an industry is, the same as what the labor movement is, cannot be defined in one word, and not in the constitution. The constitution is beyond it. What an industry means is defined in the construction which prevailed in last year's convention. What "industrial" means is to be gained from the side that stood against Coates, and that side prevailed overwhelmingly. As a matter of fact you cannot positively define them. Take, for instance, the case of the bakers that came up in the Constitution Committee. The bakers have got to the point where the pastry bakers and the black bread bakers and the pumpnickle bakers and the white bread bakers are all in one union absolutely. The shoemakers are very much divided. We have lasters, bevelers and shoestrings makers. They are in separate crafts, in separate unions. In the state of division, definition becomes impossible. All that can be defined is the spirit of it, and what the spirit of industrial unionism is can be gathered only from the debates of last year's convention and the literature that is being spread. Obviously the people who are working at building buildings are in the building industry, whether they are carpenters, plasterers, painters or what not, and that building industry has one union, and these various pursuits, these various subdivisions and occupations, are branches of that union, so that when you touch a button the building becomes empty of the men who are working on it, whereas today, if you touch a button, it is the same as if an individual man would begin to stagger, because the charters to carpenters and engineers, etc., simply cultivate by the word "charter" the errors in which they were brought up under the A. F. of L. So we do not think it is at all necessary to define it if we could, and we could not if we would, because it would take a pamphlet to illustrate the variety of trades and make the points clear.

DEL. McCUE: Mr. Chairman, I just want to say a few words. Comrade De Leon spoke about touching a button. According to the industrial plan of unionism, when you touch that button every man engaged in the construction of that building goes out of the building, but under the plan of craft organization, when you touch that button about a dozen men go out and one hundred remain in.

DEL. FOX: One goes out.

Question called for.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question has been called for. Is there any objection to giving unanimous consent to the adoption of this resolution instructing the incoming G. E. B.?

DEL. HOLMES: May I ask for a point of information? I was outside. What is the vote on?

THE CHAIRMAN: Del. Holmes, the Chair will rule that you cannot get your information if you cannot attend the convention. You must get it at first hand.

DEL. HOLMES: All right.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection?

DEL. REID: I wish to be recorded as voting no.

DEL. MOORE: I understand the arguments, but I cannot understand the resolution.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Secretary will read the resolution.

Del. Kinneally again read the resolution.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you desire a roll call?

A DELEGATE: Unanimous consent.

DEL. REID: No, that is not unanimous. I wish to record my vote no.

THE CHAIRMAN: Del. Reid wishes to be recorded no. Is there any other delegate that wishes to be recorded no?

DEL. ROGERS: I wish to be recorded no.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll call was taken.

DEL. HALL: I wish to say that I am voting no, and I want to explain it. I want it to be a part of the record. I am not voting no against the spirit of the committee in trying to direct the General Executive Board to charter industrial unions and train them, but I desire to vote no upon the implied authority of the General Executive Board to issue charters under any consideration to craft locals.

DEL. FRENCH: While voting yes, I wish to be recorded as qualifying that vote in this manner, that I do not approve of the use of that word "craft system" in there; but knowing the temper of this convention, and believing that with the makeup of this convention an Executive Board will be elected capable of safeguarding the interests of the organization, I am satisfied to vote yes and rely on their judgment.

DEL. ROGERS: Do you allow each one to explain why he voted yes or no?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, that is the delegate's privilege. He can always explain why he voted.

DEL. ROGERS: I voted no for this reason: I believe in industrial unionism, and the reason why I voted against Bro. Sherman was because I believed he worked for craft unionism; not that I know anything about the man. And I would vote against any man in this assembly that believed in craft unionism. I have endured too much to turn my face backward. I have been ostracized by society, turned out by the American Federation of Labor, and I don't propose to have anything to do with so-called revolutionists that have repudiated the doctrine of industrial unionism.

DEL. REID: I might just record why I voted no. I am entirely in accord with the spirit of this part of that. I am an industrialist first, last and all the time, so I consider it absolutely unnecessary to have a craft feature about it.

The vote stood: Total vote, 241; Yes. 231; No, 10.

THE CHAIRMAN: The resolution is adopted. It is 20 minutes of five now, and the committee from the Window Washers who are out on strike in Chicago have handed a communication to me to be read. With the consent of the house I will have the Secretary read it.

#### WINDOW WASHERS' CASE.

The Secretary read the following communication from the Window Washers:

Brother Chairman and Fellow Delegates:

We, the undersigned members of Window Washers' Union No. 299, I. W. W., strike committee, ask the Chair to grant our delegate, Bro. Oscar Olsen, an opportunity to explain before the delegates the condi-

tions we are working under. Our local has been on strike since August 1st, 1906, and we committee members are instructed by our local to see if the I. W. W. is going to give us aid in the strike as it has been doing in the past. Bro. Trautmann told us to bring it before the convention.

D. OMO, Chairman.  
JOHN PAUL,  
FRED OLSEN,  
OSCAR OLSEN,  
Strike Committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have heard the request.

DEL. KLEESE: I move that they be granted the floor. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: If there is no objection the delegate from the Window Washers will be granted the floor.

DEL. OLSEN: The Window Washers since the first of August have been putting up the first battle that was ever fought by industrial unionists in the city of Chicago. Since we went out we have been fighting and we have assisted those who are down town. Under advice from the labor leaders and from the Executive Board we have taken our men out from thirty-five buildings down town, skyscrapers with about seventy-five men. From advice, as I said, from the labor leaders and from the Executive Board, we have taken them out and put them to work in other ways, in other lines, to keep down the expenses as well as to keep them away from scabbing on us, at the same time keeping enough men in the field to conduct the strike, and as you all know, since the first of last August the weather has been a little against us. If the weather had been different in the last two months from what we have had since we engaged in it, I think we would have had success. Now, at the present time we have brought down the number of men on strike that are in need to fifteen men. All the rest are engaged in other occupations. The fifteen men are badly in need. I thank you.

DEL. FITZGERALD: I would like to ask you if you have the names of the labor leaders that advised you when the Window Washers first came out on strike.

THE CHAIRMAN: Del. Fitzgerald, if the Chair understands this matter your question has no bearing on it and it is only taking up the time of the convention. It does not make any difference who advised it, the men are out now and the question is, these men want to know whether this convention is going to continue to aid them.

DEL. OLSEN: It is hard to answer that question. I didn't say that it was the labor leaders that advised us to go out. I didn't say such a thing. I said we were advised to get work in other positions in order to keep the strike benefit down as low as possible. That is what we were advised.

DEL. RICHTER: What do you want?

DEL. OLSEN: Strike benefit. Any questions that are put to me I will answer.

DEL. FITZGERALD: The reason I asked this question is that I believe at this time this convention possibly should give them aid, but there is a fundamental principle at stake in this organization, whether the Industrial Workers of the World is going to countenance these little craft strikes of thirty or forty men without the sanction of the General Executive Board or the membership. That is something that we ought to bring out here so that we would not be in a state of chaos as we are in the A. F. of L. today. I understand that there has been a lot of graft people receiving \$20 a week here in conducting



these strikes, and they are the men that have been furthering this thing for the benefit of themselves and putting industrial unionism under their feet for their own personal aggrandizement.

DEL. OLSEN: Is that a question to me?

DEL. FITZGERALD: I am now asking the advice of the delegates.

DEL. OLSEN: That is a question that I am willing to answer.

DEL. SCHWEINBURG: I don't think it would be advisable at this time to discuss the Window Washers' strike, as it is too late. The question before the house is whether we are willing to give aid to the Window Washers. As I understood Olsen at noon time, they were offered a large amount of aid from the general organization, but as there is no president to countersign the check that Bro. Trautmann would have to draw for their aid, he has brought it before the convention to ask these delegates of the convention if they are willing to give further aid to them in their struggle, and if there is any possible way to get that money out of the bank to pay those men on strike, ain't it, Olsen?

DEL. OLSEN: Yes.

DEL. SCHWEINBURG: That is what Bro. Olsen and the Window Washers are asking.

DEL. PARKS: Mr. Chairman, I want to ask a question. Are you affiliated with the Industrial Workers of the World, your local?

DEL. OLSEN: With the organization.

DEL. PARKS: With what organization?

DEL. OLSEN: The Industrial Workers of the World.

DEL. PARKS: Is your strike legally called?

DEL. OLSEN: It is legally called.

DEL. PARKS: Is it approved by the General Executive Board?

DEL. OLSEN: Yes.

DEL. PARKS: It was approved by the General Executive Board?

DEL. OLSEN: Yes.

DEL. PARKS: At what time?

DEL. OLSEN: The President of the organization went to see the employers before the strike was pulled off.

DEL. PARKS: Pres. Sherman?

DEL. OLSEN: Yes.

DEL. PARKS: Who called the strike?

DEL. OLSEN: The Window Washers called the strike.

DEL. PARKS: The Window Washers called the strike upon the advice of Pres. Sherman?

DEL. OLSEN: He couldn't come to any settlement, any agreement, and they were going to quit suddenly in order if possible to place themselves in a position so that they could ask for a little more.

DEL. PARKS: How many members belong to the Window Washers here?

THE CHAIRMAN: Del. Parks, the Chair is of the opinion that we could settle this matter one way or the other without asking any questions.

DEL. PARKS: I will give the reason for asking the question, and then leave the floor. The reason for asking these questions is to point out the inutility of organizing little locals on craft lines, and the idea of—

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair will rule that this is out of order at the present time.

DEL. SHENKAN: I make a motion that this case be referred to the Committee on Strikes and Lockouts, for them to make a report in the morning. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: You have heard the motion. It has been regularly moved and seconded that this case be referred to the Committee on Strikes and Lockouts and that the committee be instructed to report on it in the morning. You have heard the motion. Bro. Trautmann, do you wish to speak?

SEC. TRAUTMANN: I think that is the proper course to pursue.

DEL. MCINTOSH: I think the motion is premature. I believe these men want money this afternoon to live on.

DEL. MARKLEY: There is a motion before the convention.

DEL. MCINTOSH: I am talking to this motion. I believe this convention should instruct the Secretary to pay the money. I believe that is all they want.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: May I just answer that, so as to clear the situation? The Window Washers may get some money from a special committee of the Industrial Council of Chicago, if a proper account is given. The committee has sent out special appeals, and if I am informed right they have received money to the amount of over \$100, a sum sufficient to pay strike benefits for this week. At the same time, after the situation will be explained later on by the Committee on Strikes and Lockouts, we will learn that while we don't question the cause or the reasons of the strike, nor why it has been inaugurated by that method, the fact remains that these men are now engaged in a struggle with the employing class, and if mistakes were made in connection with this strike—and I venture to say that in this strike alone the I. W. W. has made grievous mistakes—we cannot blame as much the rank and file of that organization as we can those who have been entrusted with taking care of that organization. I agree that these men are entitled to strike benefits. We should not withhold them. They are conducting a strike, and the Secretary cannot pay strike benefits, nor will he be able to draw any money out of the bank. I will be frank with them. I don't know how the situation may develop, but I was over to the bank today, and without voluntary consent is given the Industrial Workers of the World is not able to draw one solitary cent from the \$4,000 now tied up in the bank.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have heard the motion; are you ready for the question? If there is no objection on the part of any member present, this matter of the Window Washers will be referred by unanimous consent to the Committee on Strikes and Lockouts. The Chair hears none and it is so ordered. The Window Washers will meet with the Strikes and Lockouts Committee. The Secretary of the Committee on Constitution will proceed with the report.

#### CONSTITUTION COMMITTEE—PREAMBLE.

DEL. KINNEALLY: The Preamble comes next. The committee, after discussing various amendments offered by three or four or five locals amending the Preamble, and after listening to an argument from one representative and discussing it amongst the members of the committee, we came to the conclusion and recommend that the Preamble remain as it now stands.

DEL. FOX: I move to concur in the report of the committee. (Seconded.)

DEL. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, I rise to make an amendment. My amendment is that the second clause in the Preamble be amended to read: "Between these two classes a struggle must go on until all the toilers come together on the industrial field and take and hold that which they produce by their labor, through an economic organization of the working class without affiliation with any political party."

ALT. KIEFE: Second.

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been regularly moved and seconded that the report of the Committee on Constitution be amended by striking out the words "political as well as" in the second paragraph. You have heard the motion; are you ready for the question? (Question called for.)

DEL. HALL: Mr. Chairman, I desire to say simply a few words against the amendment. It occurs to me that if the amendment is adopted it implies that the workers shall not come together on any other field excepting an industrial field.

A DELEGATE: Exactly.

DEL. HALL: That means that they may be divided upon any other field that they see fit to be divided upon. Now, while the industrial is the important point, we cannot, no matter how much we wish to do so, overlook the political influence of the working class. The working class must exert a certain political influence, no matter whether they wish to or not. Even if they decided not to do it at all, they have done and must exert political influence. If this amendment is adopted it means that there is nothing wrong in the working class being divided on the political field. This Preamble does not say that the working class shall join a political party. In fact, it says the contrary; they shall not as an organization join a political party. But it expressly states that any political action which the working class takes should be undivided, should be unified, and it seems to me that that is the important proposition. We must not give license to the working class to be divided upon the political field. We must not give license to the working class to be divided upon any field, and it seems to me as it is expressed now in the Preamble that it absolutely demands working class unity every place. Even if the working class do not vote, they exercise just as much influence as though they do vote, but whatever they do, they must be a unit upon that action, whatever it is. Now, it expressly says that the Industrial Workers of the World shall not be a member of a political party—I mean as an organization, but it says that they must be united in political action. Now, if you strike out that word "political" it will give a license to the members of the Industrial Workers of the World to be divided upon the political field, and that is exactly what we do not wish to do. We don't want them to be democrats; we don't want them to be republicans; we don't want them to be S. L. P. men; we don't want them to be S. P. men. We simply want them to be a unit on any influence they exercise, and if you adopt this amendment it will give them a license to be divided. Now, I claim that political action is not important. I think I stand with the majority of the delegates upon that proposition. But I say that no matter how much the working class wish to avoid political influence, they cannot do it. If they refuse to vote they exercise just as great a political influence as though they did vote. I claim that unity is what we want, and we must teach the working class that they must not be divided upon any kind of a proposition. The Preamble states that in the very first of the proposition, and any kind of tinkering with it is not only out of place, but absolutely gives license for a wrong influence to creep into our movement.

DEL. MOORE: May I be allowed ten minutes?

THE CHAIRMAN: I suppose that is the rule. The Chair is not strictly familiar with those rules; I only heard them read once.

DEL. RICHTER: Five minutes.

ALT. KIEFE: There was a motion made that the mover of any

motion be allowed ten minutes to open the debate and close the debate, as far as I heard, and I want them to be held to it the same as any other people.

DEL. MOORE: There was an argument presented here by a man who says that "inestimable is the value, dignified the posture of the political movement. It affords the labor movement an opportunity to ventilate its purposes, its aspirations, its methods, free, open and above board, in the noonday light of the sun; whereas otherwise its agitation would be consigned to the circumscribed sphere of the rat hole." That is the assertion that is made. It says the labor movement, and it speaks of the political movement. This speaks of the political and the labor movement in the Preamble. Its text is taken from the second clause in the Preamble. In other words, it says to us that if we go out on the street behind a Socialist or Socialist Labor party button and talk industrial unionism, we can do it in the light of the noonday sun, but if we do not talk behind those buttons, behind the traditional vote, voting at a capitalist ballot box, then we will have no opportunity to talk. That don't hold together. Comrade Veal has been arrested talking behind a button. It don't hold together at all. It makes no difference; the capitalist class knows what you are doing, whether you hide behind one button or another. Then that part of the argument has nothing to it.

He says here in another place that whether the economic movement will it or not, its political phase will assert itself on the political field; that men within the ranks and men from outside of its ranks will raise the standard of labor in politics. Supposing you took the position of absence from the ballot box and had to raise that labor standard that they call a reflex something of your present interests, wouldn't you be drawn away just as easy from the position that you are in now as then? Is it not just as easy to influence that so-called political reflex that has been introduced, without mentioning any names? I hold this, that if we are going to build an economic organization we should build it right now. If we are going to build a political organization we should build it right now. In that report it does not say that a man must keep away from the ballot box. In that report it does no say absence from the ballot box, but it says to this man or to that man, "You shall not come into this convention and control it by any political party, because all politics outside of this organization is capitalist politics." It is a traditional vote, and as long as a man is in the habit of going to a capitalist ballot box his chains are on his ankles. What are any of these parties from Republican down, but amendments to the motion to keep you in wage slavery? I stand for the general lockout of the capitalist class, and no high-sounding phrase like democracy is going to turn my brain into following a man otherwise. That is all I want to say for my part.

DEL. SCHWEINBURG: Mr. Chairman and Fellow Delegates, I think the Preamble is clear in every sense of the word, as it stands today. It says here distinctly the comrades should come together on the political as well as on the industrial field. What do we mean by that? Do we want to go back to the old parties in the A. F. of L.? Are we going to hold our fellow-workers in ignorance? Are we willing to go back and let the Republican or Democratic party come into our organization and disrupt it? Are we willing to stand any such thing? I say, no. I maintain that we should come together on the political field as distinctly expressed; that it is our duty as working men. All who understand the labor movement, the principle of industrial organization, are fellow workers. If they are not up to that principle yet,

they don't drop any other movement only when they are organized on the industrial field. This is only an industrial organization, and it will not be the backbone of a party, but it will be the backbone of its own class. I am not willing to see any political party come into this organization to dominate it. I am not willing to see this organization make a pledge to any political party, but I am here to see and understand that we, the working men, must be organized on the industrial field and must be at the same time forced to organize on the political field, no matter which party it may be that may spring up with your industrial organization for the benefit of the working class. Therefore I say that the word "political" in the Preamble is very well expressed.

DEL. GOLDBERG: Mr. Chairman and Fellow Delegates, that comrade over there insinuated that we are hiding under the buttons of the S. L. P. or the S. P. Now, let me tell you we are not hiding under the circumstances, because there is a reactionary element through the country, for it will not be denied and they even cannot deny that the political field is an important factor in the labor world. As a matter of fact we must reckon with the conditions and the defense put up by the capitalist class. Now, as an illustration, the Western Federation of Miners are autonomously organized under the banner of the I. W. W., and they are in a position today to meet the capitalist class organized in the Citizens' Alliance. Now, whatever they could not accomplish through the Citizens' Alliance they are trying to accomplish through political power by taking a part of the workers from our ranks. Now, the activity of the capitalists on their side will compel them to go into politics and work in opposition to them, and whenever anybody claims that we are hiding, I want to point to this declaration for political action in the ranks of the Industrial Workers. But it is only a matter of form or a matter of procedure that the working class throughout the country are not fully educated, are not class conscious enough to go into the ranks and take concrete action in the political field. At the same time we should have an opportunity to organize them, and I hope in the coming convention we will discuss thoroughly the methods of political activity.

DEL. PARKS: Mr. Chairman, now I want to say that the man who has no faults is not on the floor of this convention. I want to say that I have seen men out under the guise of the I. W. W. simply talking politics. I have seen men who stood as organizers for the Industrial Workers of the World, or I so understood them, who took the attitude of mind that the Industrial Workers of the World was a recruiting station for some political party. That is wrong, violating our constitution, and going contrary to the Manifesto and contrary to the Preamble, and I have criticized members of the Socialist Party to their face, and I criticize them today, and say it is wrong to take such an attitude; I will not say that they are the only ones. Now, take the history of politics in the unions. The charters to the labor unions, local and international, have had a clause in them, "No politics in the union." Well, we have seen some active revolutionary men who wanted to have a politico-economic discussion of wage slavery and were not allowed to. What was the result? They said "If we can't talk economics here we will go outside and organize a class conscious organization where we can talk politics," but the great error was that they subordinated it to a political party, and that is what has brought that to an end. What is the Western experience now? The Western Federation of Miners and the American Labor Union have had an open platform and said, "We will have a discussion of working class politics and working class economics," and they were

brought in. What was the result? The result was that they proceeded to take advantage of the situation, of the different offices, in behalf of the working class. What was the result? We see that they there forced the revolutionary issue, and in the West the politicians and the employing class who considered the union as a stepping stone to official position were being blocked in their endeavors to control the political condition in the Western states, and so they began to put working men up who stood for working class economics. Now, they told us in 1896 and 1900 that if Bryan was elected they would close the mines and mills and factories. Mr. Theodore Roosevelt in his book, "American Ideals," said that if the working class of this country should elect such a man as John P. Altgeld or Governor Waite of Colorado to any official position and gain control of the government, that such a country would go to pieces in a year, and he said that it ought to and should go to pieces. I take it that the great function of the Industrial Workers of the World is to organize the men in the industries so that when we get the industries headed by men well posted in those matters the working class will determine that they are going to rule this country. I think that is the way we are going to perform the great function of this organization. We are going to take and hold these industries in which we shall be organized, and operate them for the benefit of the co-operative commonwealth, and we are not going to allow this work to be defeated by the capitalists or the capitalist politicians.

ALT. KIEFE: Brother Chairman, I don't want to make much of a speech, but I disagree with Bro. Moore on the whole proposition. He says that without the political movement our industrial agitation will have a tendency to be circumscribed to the narrow sphere of a rat hole. But he might have used any other illustration in its place. It is true, and why? Because of the existence of the political government and the political parties of capitalism. We have not got them out of existence yet. Do we, because we recognize the fact that the working class must defend itself where it is attacked, say that we must hide behind the button of any political party? That is an entirely different assertion. We will hide behind nothing. We will come out in the open as far as possible. We will defend ourselves where we are attacked, not following the biblical injunction to turn the other cheek to the enemy that smites you on the one. The brother says that because we stick our ballots in the S. L. P. or S. P. or any other working class political ballot box, that it becomes a capitalist ballot. I ask you, Bro. Moore, if you sheathe a working class sword, made by labor and wielded by labor, in the heart of some capitalist, will that be a capitalist sword?

DEL. MOORE: I will answer that argument.

ALT. KIEFE: When I get through. Our measure of sticking our ballots in the capitalist ballot box is just a defensive one. We recognize not their authority by doing it, and I say that when the crisis comes we will stick at nothing at all; but need we lay down when we are attacked and fail to administer a blow where we have the opportunity to administer it, because the enemy is pursuing strategical tactics against us? Let them count our ballots out, we will stick them in just the same. That does not prevent us from counting our ballots elsewhere. When the necessity for our doing that comes we can do it just as well and we can poll our ballots in two places if necessary.

DEL. TULLAR: Mr. Chairman, I want to express a view on this same line from a different standpoint. I am a member of a political party, but I am not speaking as a politician; I am speaking as a mem-

ber of the Industrial Workers of the World, and upon that standpoint only. And I want to say to Bro. Moore that if he surveys the distant future he must agree with me when I say that the agricultural districts and agricultural elements of the working class are going to be the last and the hardest to be organized into this economic organization, and that while we may have the wage slaves of the industrial centers organized, when the crisis comes we will find the wage slaves of the industrial centers organized in an economic organization and bucking against a combination of capitalists and agriculturists, and when that time comes we will of necessity have to exercise our political rights to overthrow that opposition. Now, as to your contention that we are wasting our efforts, I have nothing to say. If I was speaking as a politician, a member of a political party, I might perhaps have more to say, but I am speaking only as a member of the Industrial Workers of the World.

DEL. RICHTER: Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the fullest discussion that is possible under this head, because I hold that upon a clear conception of that clause in the constitution will depend whether we shall gain all those that are desirous of becoming members of the Industrial Workers of the World. To hold that it is not necessary for the working class to take notice of the political field is simply to say that we should tie the hands of a man and let him only walk on his feet. I hold that it is necessary for any member of the Industrial Workers of the World to recognize that whilst he is a wage worker, owing to the condition under which he makes his living, he is at the same time a citizen, and being a citizen he has a certain power. Now, the question arises, "Shall he continue the policy of the laboring men of the past, by handing the power which he possesses as a wage-working citizen over to the capitalist class so that it may be used against him the moment he makes an effort to improve his condition on the economic field?" Any man that views the situation and has had a chance to observe the effect, will recognize that it is simply suicidal; that it prevents us from using all the powers at our hand in behalf of our class. To claim that participation in politics means to acknowledge and recognize capitalism is ridiculous. The Industrial Workers of the World was organized as an economic organization, due to the recognized fact that there are two classes in society. Consequently if they hold that the workers should come together on the political as well as on the industrial field, we come together as wage workers, and that we have an identical interest, and especially we have the same identical interest as citizen wage-workers. And therefore I hold that if a man takes the obligation as a member of this organization there is a duty upon that member to be active at all times, and especially on election day, in behalf of his class and of himself as a member thereof. For without recognizing that feature of our existence in society, but ignoring it, it is impossible for any one to justify industrial unionism. Industrial unionism takes into consideration all the phases of the wage workers' existence, and consequently I hold that the Preamble as it reads today is proper. I only wish that some of the delegates here who are more able to explain the various features in connection with it would do so, so that the members or delegates can have a proper definition of this clause of the constitution; because during the last year many differences have arisen in my personal experience in regard to its interpretation. They have used the last clause, "no affiliation with any political party," to imply that we should have nothing to do with politics. Politics is one thing and a political party is another thing. A political party is the means through which the

politics of the working class as well as the politics of the capitalist class manifests itself and exercises itself. Now, to confuse the two certainly does not help the working class to a clear comprehension of their situation.

DEL. FORBERG: Mr. Chairman and delegates, I have not spoken before this convention before, and I intend to say just a few words now. Many of us think that working class politics does not necessarily mean voting party tickets at all. In other words, politics is nothing more or less than tactical. Anything that attempts to change the mode of distribution of wealth is of a political nature, and it does not matter whether it is by voting at the ballot box or whether it is by becoming united in the shops, it is political action. In other words, I would like to say that the movement that has been on foot in Russia for the last year and a half has been a political movement, although the working class there have no ballot and no way of expressing their views, at a capitalist ballot box or otherwise, and yet their actions all have been of a political nature. The only ones at the Douma that had a program were the organized workers, the economic organization of the working class. I want to say again that if we cut this clause out of the constitution or out of the preamble of our constitution, that then the working class will not get together on the political as well as on the industrial field, and then it simply means that we shall attempt to get them together in a pure and simple labor organization without any effort to take and hold the machinery of production that belongs to the working class, because the working class have produced it and put it in operation. Now, to show you again that the people who accepted the preamble as it is are the ones that stand for working class unity, I want to say that our convention is an example of that fact. You have seen lined up together for the last two weeks nearly a little band of revolutionists; men belonging to the Socialist Labor party, men belonging to the Socialist party, men called revolutionists that do not belong in any political party of any name or nature; and I want to call your attention to the fact that when we were delayed by the politicians in this convention the first man to take up an appeal to the convention was this fellow over here that opposes this clause. Reactionists don't stand for working class unity. The revolutionists stand for working class unity, no matter how you understand it. I want to tell you now that several delegates in this convention have tried to make light of action on the political field because they called attention over and over again to the fact that Daniel De Leon has been the leader of the S. L. P. ever since it has been in existence, a party of which I am not a member. But I say Daniel De Leon may be a member of the S. L. P., but he has stood in this convention for working class unity. Those who do not understand that political action does not mean some particular political party have no conception of working class unity. Let us accept the preamble as it is and stand for the working class forming in an economic organization to take and hold the things we produce. Let us give to the working class the education that will enable them to understand that politics does not necessarily mean a particular political party.

DEL. FOOTE: Mr. Chairman and fellow delegates, I have not as yet occupied the time of the delegates in this convention, and do not now care to do so. I simply want to make one point which I think is essential in understanding the document under consideration. From a sociological point of view it is correct, absolutely. The first proposition to take into consideration is that a society, a given society under which we now live, is an organism, and that organism is a politi-



cal state, flowing from and called the body politic. Every action of every individual in this organized society is a political action, whether it be as you say on the industrial or on the economic field. We cannot get away from it. The action of the Industrial Workers of the World as a so-called economic organization is a political action in an organized society. As far as the capitalist ballot is concerned we have nothing to do with that in this present consideration. I say that from a sociological point of view this document is absolutely correct. The manner of interpretation should not be allowed to destroy the work that has been done in this matter, for there can be no evidence brought to bear but what every action of every man in a political society is a political act. If that is granted, the economic organization in action is in political action. As far as taking and holding is concerned, the economic organization can take, but can it hold without the outgrowing of another power which will take into consideration the functions of the capitalist class and their manner of operation? I thank you.

DEL. M'INTOSH: The preamble as it now stands, if we read it rightly, says "Until the toilers come together on the political as well as on the industrial field." If we read that to mean that they must use the capitalist ballot box, then it contradicts the first clause of the first paragraph, because the first clause of the first paragraph says that the working class and the capitalist class have nothing in common. Then if we interpret that to mean the use of the capitalist ballot box it would mean certainly to admit that the working class had the capitalist ballot box in common with the capitalist class. But I do not infer that it means that. I do not infer that it means that our political action or our coming together on the political field is the use of the capitalist ballot box at all. I have no use for the capitalist ballot box, not a particle. For my part I want us to have a ballot box of our own. I want to use the same weapon that the capitalist class do. I want to use his weapon against him. Now, we can take our vote inside of our organization (applause), and by that means we can know how strong we are. By that means we can know how many of us are ready to take and hold the machinery of production and distribution, but by no other means could we find out. We could absolutely have no knowledge of our strength by the number of votes counted out to us from the capitalist ballot box. Now, again, I admit with Bro. Foote that any action of the working class is political action. I admit that, but I want to say that today where the capitalist has his power, where he gets his political power, is by the fact that he has the economic power (applause), and when his economic power fails his political state fails because its foundation is gone. Over in Montana—I believe some of these men from Montana will perhaps bear me out in what I am going to say now—over in Montana the legislature of that State passed a law that did not suit the men who owned the mines and smelters in the State of Montana, and when the men who owned the smelters and mines of the State of Montana did not like that law they simply closed down the mills and smelters and mines and said to the Governor, "These mines and smelters will stay closed down until you call the legislature together and repeal the law that is offensive to us."

THE CHAIRMAN: Your time is up.

DEL. DUMAS: I want to speak on the motion to strike out the word "politics." We imply by the word "economic" the means of production. Consequently when we take the means of production out of the hands of that class we mean to send our men to operate them

for the other side. That is all we have to say on that point. And I tell you it is not a question of the western mines now, for we don't want any monkey business from now on.

DEL. MOORE: May I have the privilege of closing? I don't want to get personal, but I want to call attention to this fact. The local that this delegate represents, No. 85 in this city, has gone on record in the Industrial Worker as not agreeing to come together on the political field.

DEL. FORBERG: I want to state that Local 85 simply wanted that discussed and nothing more.

DEL. MOORE: You get the Industrial Worker of two months ago and read it; it is there. Now, there is a clause in this book (referring to Del. De Leon's Minneapolis speech on the Preamble) that says: "Despite the sharply marked economic feature of the labor movement, the principle that it is bound to take on a political form also is founded on no fine-spun theory. Even discounting the force of the sociologic argument that I have presented to you and which points to the inevitableness of the political manifestation of the labor movement, which was a consideration that I have referred to only incidentally so far, and which when properly offered would place the matter beyond the peradventure of a doubt."

DEL. FORBERG: I rise to a point of order. He is not answering the argument produced on the floor. He is answering something that took place somewhere else.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair overrules the point.

DEL. MOORE: Del. St. John, I am quoting. Am I in order?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes; proceed.

DEL. MOORE: "That consideration is the existence of universal suffrage in the land." And remember you that. "The institution is so bred in the bones of the people that notwithstanding it has become a gravel in the shoe of the capitalist, he, powerful though he be, dare not abolish it outright." I admit he dares not because that would give us just what we are after. What we want is the real thing. But he says, "among such a people chimerical is the idea of expecting to conduct a great movement whose palpable aim is a socialist revolution, to the slogan of 'Abstinence from the ballot box.' The proposition cannot choose but brand its supporters as freaks." Here I am, a member of the Industrial Workers of the World, and this man tells me that I am a freak because I want to go outside of my organization and vote at a capitalist ballot box. The point has been made and it has been demonstrated that we cannot tell our strength at that box. We can tell it here, and if you don't know it the capitalist class knows our strength just as well as it does their own, and the thermometer that is held up before you does not register. He says that any amount of counting out will have no effect because there is, he says, an absolute thermometer that registers. It does not register. The capitalist papers are the tally sheets of that thermometer, and those tally sheets do not comply with the votes that you put in that ballot box. That is all.

(Question called for.)

THE CHAIRMAN: The Secretary will call the roll.

A DELEGATE: State the question.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question before the house is to amend the Preamble of the present constitution by striking out all after the word "on" in the second paragraph, second line, up to the word "the" in front of "Industrial field," making the paragraph read, "Between these two classes a struggle must go on until all the toilers come to-

gether on the industrial field and take and hold that which they produce by their labor." The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was then called.

DEL. MOORE: I would like to state that this point will come up after the vote is counted. I was instructed to take up a substitute for your consideration in connection with this preamble. I am sure everybody will agree with it and it won't take very long. I would like to do it when this vote is counted.

THE CHAIRMAN: I don't understand, Del Holmes. Do I understand that you desire to offer a further amendment to the report of the Committee on Constitution on the preamble after this?

DEL. HOLMES: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair will rule that out of order at this time.

DEL. HOLMES: I would like to put myself on record after this. You have ruled me out of order. If you will allow me to state what it is, I think it is a very necessary thing. This is in regard to a proposition where it does not make clear the fact that none but actual wage earners shall belong to the Industrial Workers of the World. It takes in men that are not such wage earners at present, and we have had all kinds of trouble from it.

THE CHAIRMAN: I will state that that will be attended to at the proper time.

DEL. M'CUE: Brother Chairman and fellow delegates, it has been said by the General Secretary-Treasurer of our organization—

SECRETARY TRAUTMANN: Wait a moment. Let me first compile the vote.

The vote was then announced as follows: Total vote, 610; Yes, 243; No, 367.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion to amend is lost. The motion before the house now is to concur in the recommendation of the committee. You have heard the motion. Are you ready for the question? (Question called for).

DEL. DUNCAN: I object to this question being put here without a consideration of five amendments that I have offered as coming through me as a representative of Local 222 at Spokane. I have submitted five separate resolutions in the regular way and they have come before the committee, and the committee has given them a partial consideration, but I consider the consideration they got very partial. If it is in order now I would like to insert the first amendment and take it up on its own merits, the rest to come afterwards. I think these have got a right to a hearing here, and they should have been reported on by the committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is the understanding of the Chair that these amendments have been acted on by the committee, and that the way the matter is before the house now any motion to amend or consider any amendment will be out of order, unless a motion to take the matter up in the proper form is made.

DEL. DUNCAN: This body knows nothing about the contents of these amendments and knows nothing about the merits of the case, and I submit to you that they have a right to know.

DEL. DE LEON: A point of order. If this body knows nothing about these amendments it is not the fault of the Committee on Constitution, but it is the fault of the delegate who has them in hand. The course for him to have taken was to offer them as amendments to the proposed amendment. He could have brought in at least three of them, two as amendments and one as a substitute. If this body

knows nothing about them it is not our fault; it is the delegate's fault. He should have presented them as amendments to the motion made.

DEL. DUNCAN: There was one amendment pending to the motion that was put before the house, and I thought it would be better not to interfere with anybody else's case and let mine be considered at a later time. Therefore I think it would be in order to offer another amendment now.

THE CHAIRMAN: If Del. Duncan remembers, that matter was decided some time ago by this body, that when a vote was taken upon an amendment it not only debarred any further amendments to the pending motion, but shut off any further debate, and the Chair will so rule at this time.

DEL. DUNCAN: Then I appeal from the ruling of the Chair.

THE CHAIRMAN: The decision of the Chair has been appealed from. Those who desire to sustain the Chair will vote yes; those who desire to sustain the appeal will vote no. The Secretary will call the roll.

Del. Heslewood was called to the chair.

The roll was called as far as the name of McMullen.

DEL. McMULLEN: As I understand, the Chair ruled that any further amendment could not be entertained.

THE CHAIRMAN, pro tem: Yes, that was the decision of the Chair.

DEL. McMULLEN: That the motion to concur in the report of the committee could not be amended.

THE CHAIRMAN, pro tem: As far as the Preamble was concerned.

DEL. McMULLEN: That was the effect, though.

THE CHAIRMAN, pro tem: That was the substance, as I understand, that no more amendments would be allowed by the Chair. That was the decision of the Chair.

DEL. McMULLEN: You know I am instructed. I have a plank from the coal miners of the Western Federation of Miners to present to this Preamble. You know that proceeding. Therefore I am compelled to vote no, against the Chair.

The roll was continued to the name of Frueh.

DEL. FRUEH: I would like to state that I vote no on this proposition because according to the decision of the Chair it shuts off further debate and excludes any further amendment to that question, and I am not satisfied that the question has been thoroughly thrashed out. I have been waiting for arguments that I have not heard. I vote no; at the same time I recognize that the Chair was right in his decision.

The roll was then completed.

DEL. SCHOMBERG: May I ask a question?

THE CHAIRMAN, pro tem: Why, certainly.

DEL. SCHOMBERG: Who was in the chair when that rule was made?

THE CHAIRMAN, pro tem: Bro. St. John.

DEL. SCHOMBERG: Then is Bro. St. John allowed to vote in sustaining himself?

THE CHAIRMAN, pro tem: He left the chair to vote.

DEL. SCHOMBERG: He left the chair?

THE CHAIRMAN, pro tem: Yes.

DEL. SCHOMBERG: Are you sustaining what was the decision of the Chair at that time?

THE CHAIRMAN, pro tem: Yes, I am sustaining what Comrade St. John did at that time.

Del. St. John resumed the chair.

DEL. GOLDBERG: Bro. Chairman, I want to answer that delegate (referring to Del. Schomberg).

THE CHAIRMAN: Never mind; it is not necessary.

The vote was then announced: Total vote, 589; Yes, 362; No, 237.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair is sustained.

ALT. KIEFFE: Mr. Chairman, I want to get information. Does that mean that the working class should come together on the political as well as the economic field? I want to get an understanding.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let us have a little order now.

DEL. DUNCAN: A question of personal privilege. I will state as a matter of information that the Secretary of the Committee on Constitution promised me, before I came here, that every one of those resolutions would be read before this body before their report was submitted here to be acted on, and, relying on that promise, I was in no hurry to make a motion. If it is in order now, I move you as a substitute for the whole that we first consider every amendment that any one in this house has to offer on that Preamble before we adopt that.

DEL. RYAN: A point of order.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair will rule—

ALT. KIEFFE: Mr. Chairman, I want an understanding. I ask for information.

THE CHAIRMAN: The delegate will come to order. Wait till the Chair recognizes the point of order.

DEL. RYAN: I made no promise.

THE CHAIRMAN: What is your point of order?

DEL. RYAN: My point of order is that the delegate has not acted properly in raising the question of personal privilege and then discussing it as he did in this convention at this time.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair would rule the point of order well taken.

DEL. RYAN: I want to raise a question of personal privilege on behalf of myself and colleagues in the mining industry. I don't like to thrust myself at this time upon the deliberations of the convention during the report of the Committee on Constitution, but we are instructed to bring before this convention—

THE CHAIRMAN: You have the floor on a point of personal privilege, if you will be brief.

DEL. RYAN: I will be so brief that I will even refrain from reading the communication, and will ask the Secretary to read it and take it out of whatever time the Chair will give me. It is an instruction to the delegates from the mining districts in regard to the Preamble.

DEL. KINNEALLY: Mr. Chairman and comrades, the representatives of the Mining Department asked me if I thought that the Committee on Constitution would have any objections at this time to presenting this resolution of the representatives as requested by the Denver convention. So far as a member of that committee I have no objection, and I do not think any of the rest of the committee has, unless the body objects.

THE CHAIRMAN: Read it.

Del. Ryan read the following communication:

## POLITICAL ENDORSEMENT.

Chicago, Ill., Sept. 27, 1906.

To the Second Annual Convention of the Industrial Workers of the World:

We, the undersigned delegates of the Department of Mining Industry, in accordance with instructions of the fourteenth annual convention of said department, hereby submit the following resolution, which was adopted by the said convention and which we have been instructed to present to your body:

Resolved, that the second annual convention of the Industrial Workers of the World shall adopt and submit to a referendum vote of the membership for their ratification, so that it may become a part of the preamble of the constitution of the Industrial Workers of the World, the following: "That the Industrial Workers of the World does not desire the endorsement of any political party, neither will the Industrial Workers of the World endorse any political party."

Respectfully submitted,

JOHN McMULLEN.  
VINCENT ST. JOHN.  
P. R. McDONALD.  
ALBERT RYAN.

DEL. TULLAR: I move its adoption.

DEL. LINGENFELTER: That should properly come before the Resolution Committee. It should be a resolution, and the Resolution Committee could act upon it immediately and come back in the proper manner.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair understood it was introduced as a matter of personal privilege; that Bro. Ryan, rising for the delegates from the Mining Department, myself included, who have been included in introducing that resolution, that we were instructed to ask the privilege of introducing it. It is for the convention to say what disposition you wish to make of it.

DEL. DE LEON: This proposition does not propose to amend the action taken by this convention a minute ago. It is simply a recommendation that a concrete thing be submitted to a referendum vote of this organization, and that concrete thing is that this organization does not and should not endorse any political party. Isn't that it?

DEL. Ryan: Yes.

DEL. De Leon: I move you to accept that request and to send it to a referendum. (Seconded.)

DEL. FOX: I think we could take this vote first, and vote on that afterwards. That properly comes after this vote. That is what I was going to suggest when I got up. But to introduce the new motion is to repudiate the decision of the Chair made a moment ago. Let this come up immediately after this vote.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair will so rule.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: The vote has been announced, Fox.

DEL. FOX: We are going to vote on this Preamble now, and then this can be taken up immediately after.

THE CHAIRMAN: The point is well taken.

DEL. DE LEON: In view of that I ask leave to withdraw that motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: The vote now occurs on the motion to concur in the Committee on Constitution's report on the Preamble. The Secretary will call the roll.

DEL. McMullen: I understand by this motion that we cannot have any debate, and I do not feel that we can and do not want any. I understand you to say a motion was made to concur in the report of the committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Committee on Constitution.

DEL. McMullen: As I understand, the recommendation of the committee was that there be no amendment to the Preamble.

THE CHAIRMAN: That there be no change in the Preamble.

DEL. McMULLEN: That there be no change in the Preamble, and at the same time on a question of privilege you allowed a delegate, a representative of the Mining Department, to bring in a proposition that he wants added as an amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN: Which he wants submitted to a referendum vote.

DEL. McMULLEN: He wants this organization first to say what you will do. If you adopt this motion, which I understand will prevail, to concur in the recommendation of the committee, the action of this convention can never be changed unless you rescind or reconsider. We of the Mining Department cannot agree with this. We do not want any more privileges in this convention than this brother here. We as a bunch of men do not want any more consideration than is given to anybody else.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair will rule that your point is out of order. That is not the question before the house. The motion is to concur.

DEL. HOLMES: I would like to ask as a point of information to have some one tell me if that is embodied in the constitution, that none but actual wage workers can be members of the Industrial Workers of the World.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is further on. The resolution is not before the house.

DEL. PARKS: I would ask the question then, if this matter that is coming up from the Mining Department contradicts the Preamble, if it would not be wise for us to refer the whole matter back to the Committee on Constitution and have them report, amending it if there be any conflict in the two different resolutions.

THE CHAIRMAN: The vote is on the motion to concur in the committee's report. The secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called as far as Parks.

DEL. PARKS: I want to know just what we are voting on.

THE CHAIRMAN: To concur in the committee's report.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Not to change the Preamble.

DEL. PARKS: I am not in favor of changing the spirit, but if there is any change in the form that ought to be made, I think we ought to make it. I think the matter really has gone a little too far for me, and I am going to vote no under protest. I am in favor of the Preamble as it stands.

The roll call was then completed.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am going to refer this communication or resolution from the Mining Department to the Committee on Constitution and let them make a report, with the consent of the house.

DEL. McMULLEN: Can't this delegate over here have the same consideration for his resolution?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, he can submit his resolution.

DEL. FRENCH: I would like to ask Bro. Duncan if it is not a fact that instead of submitting the resolution or proposed amendment that he has got there to this convention to be read when the secretary read the roll of resolutions and have them referred to the various commit-

tees—if instead of doing that, whether he did not take them personally to the committee in a bunch of papers and communications so as to put them in the possession of the committee without having them read to the convention.

DEL. RICHTER: It was read in the convention.

The vote was then announced: Total vote, 600; Yes, 359; No. 241.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is carried to concur in the committee's report. Now, then, Del. Duncan, Del. French asked if instead of submitting your resolutions to the convention and having them read and submitting them in the convention to the Committee on Constitution, you submitted them personally to the Committee on Constitution.

DEL. DUNCAN: I will state that that is not the fact. I submitted them to the secretary of this organization and he read them in this convention when the other resolutions were submitted, and they were regularly referred to the Constitution Committee, and I appeared before the Constitution Committee for a hearing at the proper time, and gained a very incomplete one, but I did get a promise from the secretary of the Constitution Committee that I was entitled to another hearing on the floor of this convention, and that those resolutions would all be read here again before their report was acted on. Now, fellow delegates, if this is to be conducted as a convention of a bona fide revolutionary organization should be—

THE CHAIRMAN: Del. Duncan, you simply rose to answer the question of Bro. French, and you have answered it.

DEL. DUNCAN: I will answer it.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have answered.

DEL. DUNCAN: Have I?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

DEL. FRENCH: I understand it was the other way. That is the reason I wanted to know.

#### I. W. W. FUNDS IN BANK.

THE CHAIRMAN: Now, the Chair would ask you to be seated, and I want the delegates to give me their time for a second. The secretary-treasurer has told you as to the status of the funds of this organization in the bank at the present time, and Del. McCue desires to make a motion to relieve that situation, and I want to give him the floor, because it is an important matter and it is getting late.

DEL. McCUE: Mr. Chairman and brother delegates, we have heard the General Secretary-Treasurer say that he is unable to get any of the funds of this organization from the bank in which they are deposited. It is a critical condition. I move you, Mr. Chairman, that this body proceed now to elect a committee of five to accompany the General Secretary-Treasurer and proceed to the bankers and acquaint them with the exact conditions that have caused this condition to exist, in order that we may procure the funds necessary to carry on the work of the organization. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair is of the opinion that the motion made would not meet the case.

DEL. McCUE: Let me just say that if anybody here can conceive of a better motion I hope that they will get right up and make it now. Suppose I add, "and take such steps as will be necessary to procure the funds."

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Any committee that you may select or appoint will not be able to draw any funds from the bank, except you can induce the former president of the Industrial Workers of the



World to countersign a check. This noon when I went over, accompanied by Comrade Maichele and Comrade Sims, I found myself confronted with the situation that bills contracted by the Transportation Department to the amount of \$260, of which—

THE CHAIRMAN: Never mind the amount of the bill.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: \$102 has to be paid within twenty-four hours. The manager of the Fraternal Supply Company came up this afternoon and said he had been approached—

THE CHAIRMAN: Bro. Trautmann, please tell the supposed money in the bank and never mind telling us about others.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: I say this because I have to pay these bills and I should not pay them.

THE CHAIRMAN: Tell us what the banker told you.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: The bankers simply told us—I asked them whether Sherman had been there, and they said yes. They said we could not draw any money. I asked whether we could get a committee from the convention to explain the status of this organization and demand that the money be released or a proper committee be allowed to draw the money as required for the incidental expenses of this organization, and they said, "No, it is absolutely impossible, because you cannot draw any money under the name of the Industrial Workers of the World except the former president releases the funds under his name and allows the money to be drawn."

DEL. GOLDBERG: I move you, Bro. Chairman, that the secretary should consult a lawyer who should take control of our properties in the bank and in the office pending a suit. (Seconded.)

DEL. SHENKAN: I would like as a point of information to know—

DEL. PARKS: I did not second Goldberg's motion. I seconded McCue you will let the Chair I will state it. I want to say that I am going to say that if a motion is made which I do not think is going to fill the bill I am going to say so. We could amend Bro. Goldberg's motion.

DEL. PARKS: I did not second Goldberg's motion. I seconded McCue's motion.

DEL. SHENKAN: I would like to get a point of information. If I get this point of information I may be able to make the correct motion. I would like to know from the secretary if it would be possible for this convention to instruct the secretary to send a written note to the effect that the president has been deposed and that a committee of five or so has been elected to succeed him to take charge of the funds, with the seal of the organization attached.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: This organization not being incorporated, the bank will not recognize any act of the organization. If the former president of the organization voluntarily agrees to remove his name as president of the organization in the bank accounts, then well and good, and then a committee may be selected and may be empowered to draw the funds. But if he does not voluntarily agree to do so, you cannot draw a solitary cent.

DEL. FITZGERALD: Mr. Chairman, this is in the form of a suggestion and I am doing this and putting it forth for what I think it is worth, and it is this: That I believe at this time that the best way out of this is for this convention to immediately elect its General Secretary and its Assistant General Secretary and its Executive Board, and therefore you nullify all past motions and acts of the Executive Board and you put the funds into the control of this organization, and you cannot do it until this convention takes such action.

DEL. MAICHELE: It is a fact that there isn't any way of getting this money out of the bank, for the bank will not recognize any committee or anything of that nature, but they will recognize the credentials of the delegates who have attended. So I should think the Credentials Committee should be sent up there with the credentials, and they will undoubtedly deliver the goods.

DEL. PINKERTON: I move that a committee be appointed by the Chair to wait on Ex-President Sherman and ask or request him to release the funds in the bank. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been regularly moved and seconded that the Chair appoint a committee of—

VARIOUS DELEGATES: Three; five; seven.

DEL. MARKLEY: Three is enough.

THE CHAIRMAN: To wait on Bro. Sherman and ask him to release the funds in the bank. You have heard the motion; are you ready for the question?

DEL. MARKLEY: And demand his written answer.

THE CHAIRMAN: It will be understood that that is accepted. Are you ready for the question? (Question called for.) If there is no objection the motion will be considered passed unanimously. The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The Chair will appoint Bros. McDonald, Ryan, Petriella, Cox and Fox.

DEL. PETRIELLA: I decline.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair tried to select this committee with a view of not further antagonizing C. O. Sherman.

On motion, adjourned until 9 o'clock A. M., Saturday, Sept. 29.

### THIRTEENTH DAY, SATURDAY, SEPT. 29. MORNING SESSION.

The convention was called to order at 9 A. M. by Chairman St. John.

Assistant Secretary Edwards called the roll of delegates.

### CREDENTIALS.

The secretary read the following credential:

"This is to certify that Paul Flaschkamp was elected delegate to represent Local Union No. 1 in the place of H. A. Buche at the regular meeting Thursday, Sept. 27, to the convention of the I. W. W. (Signed and sealed.) (To take the place of Del. Hulse.)"

DEL. MARKLEY: In view of the fact that I was refused the right to represent a Chicago local that sent credentials, I thought this thing was done away with, giving proxy to another. I would like to have the sense of the convention on that. I don't want to stand in the way, but if I am denied why should another fellow be allowed to have a privilege that is denied to me? I ask your advice.

DEL. SCHWEINBURG: I would like to explain. Thursday O'Donnell took a delegateship under a provision that he could keep his job after the convention adjourned, but at the same time the local union took action on it and elected an alternate who should attend the convention, and he would have lost his job if he would have laid off at the Standard Iron Works.

THE CHAIRMAN: This credential is before the committee, not O'Donnell's nor anybody else's.

DEL. SCHWEINBURG: I am speaking about the credential. And he informed that elected delegate, Paul Flaschkamp, that he should attend the convention as he could not attend it any more or he would lose his job. For that reason I present his credentials.

DEL. MOORE: Am I not right in making the statement that Del. Desmond is and has been casting Gilchrist's vote and a vote from another local? That is the way I understood it.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is news to the Chair if such is the case.

DEL. KLEESE: I move as an amendment that Markley be given a vote.

THE CHAIRMAN: There is no motion before the house.

DEL. KLEESE: Then I move as an original motion that Markley be given the vote that was transferred to him by sealed communication from the local union.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair will rule that out of order. This credential, in the opinion of the Chair, is a new proposition.

DEL. COX: I move that we accept the credential and that the brother be seated. (Seconded.)

DEL. MARKLEY: I do not stand against this delegate getting a vote, but I want to know why a privilege will be allowed to one delegate and denied another.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair has already ruled on that, Bro. Markley.

DEL. MARKLEY: I am speaking to the motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair will rule that your remarks along that line are not to the motion.

DEL. MARKLEY: I do not want to deny the right, but I would like to know why the convention takes that stand.

DEL. FITZGERALD: I call for a unanimous vote on this without a roll call, if there is no objection.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question? (Question called for.) If there is on objection the motion will be declared carried by unanimous consent.

DEL. KLEESE: You may record me as objecting.

DEL. MOORE: I don't object. I simply want to know if Comrade Desmond is not from the same local.

DEL. DESMOND: No.

DEL. MOORE: Then I don't object.

THE CHAIRMAN: With one objection the motion is carried.

DEL. KLEESE: Two votes objecting.

THE CHAIRMAN: Del. Kleese objects.

#### COMMITTEE ON BANK FUNDS.

DEL. COX: As secretary of the special committee appointed last night, I wish to say that we cannot find Sherman anywhere and therefore we have nothing to report.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have heard the report of your special committee appointed last night. If there are no objections it will be received and the committee continued. The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

#### CONSTITUTION COMMITTEE—DELEGATES TO CONVENTION.

The Committee on Constitution continued its report.

DEL. KINNEALLY: We present an additional paragraph to Article VI, on the convention:

"The General Executive Board shall draw up a list of delegates against whom no charges have been filed at the general office. The General Recording Secretary shall call the convention to order and read the aforesaid list, and the delegates on said list shall proceed to form a temporary organization by electing a temporary chairman and a Committee on Credentials."

DEL. KLEESE: I move its adoption. (Seconded.)

The motion to adopt was carried unanimously.

DEL. KINNEALLY: Article on proposed amendments to the constitution:

"Amendments to the constitution shall be in the hands of the General Executive Board and published in the 'Industrial Worker' at least two months before the convening of the convention. No other amendments shall be considered.

DEL. MARKLEY: I move its adoption. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been regularly moved and seconded that this section of the Constitution Committee's report just read be adopted. You have heard the motion; are you ready for the question?

DEL. PARKS: I want to say that I object to this proposed amendment. The last new clause that we have placed in the constitution covers a defect in the old constitution which we knew nothing of prior to coming to this convention. We did not know that Charles O. Sherman was going to set himself up as a high czar and appoint and select a Credentials Committee contrary to the wishes of the vast majority of the delegates to this convention. We do not know what oversight there may be in this constitution that may come to light at the next convention, and I think it would be wrong for us to abridge the right of the next convention when they are assembled here to make such changes in the constitution as they think are proper and as they may deem absolutely essential and necessary. Therefore I enter my objection to having any other amendments considered except such as have been proposed two months beforehand and published in the "Industrial Worker."

DEL. SCHWEINBURG: I move the adoption of that section for the reason, not only of limiting the work of the convention, but that every local union throughout the country has a right to send an amendment to the constitution in to the general office two months prior to the convening of the convention, and every delegate to the convention and every member of the organization will have a chance to read the amendment and get the merits of the case tested here at the convention. It will do away with the Constitution Committee in the convention even, as every delegate to the convention will have in black and white before him what amendments proposed by the different locals are pending, and it will be decided right without any long discussion, because they have made up their minds already whether the amendment is good or bad.

DEL. MOORE: I am opposed to the amendment. My experience has been with our official papers, whether so-called party papers or not, that there has always been a tendency to dictate what should go in and what should not go in. Whether it will exist with this I do not know, but I know this, it looks unjust to me that anything that might rise during the two or three months before the convention should be laid over till the next. It would be very proper for any local union to make out an amendment ten days before the convention and send it by their delegate.

Question called for.

THE CHAIRMAN: The secretary will call the roll.

DEL. DUNCAN: I would like to hear the resolution read again before we vote on it.

Del. Kinneally read the proposed amendment.

DEL. SIMS: I move unanimous adoption. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Unanimous adoption has been called for.

DELEGATES: Object to the motion.

The roll was then called, and resulted: Total vote, 359; yes, 196; no, 163.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is carried.

#### ILLINOIS MINERS.

DEL. COX: A question of special privilege. I would like to request the Constitution Committee that they allow John M. Francis to speak. He has been here some time wanting the floor. The Credentials Committee, I understand, stated that he would have the privilege at an opportune time. He informs me that he is out of money, the coal miners having paid his wages and expenses, and he means to go home on the 12 o'clock train. I would like to request with the consent of the committee and the house that he be given the floor a few minutes.

DEL. SHENKAN: I move that he be given the floor.

THE CHAIRMAN: If there is no objection the delegate will be given the floor 15 minutes.

JOHN M. FRANCIS, Du Quoin, Ill.: Fellow-workers and comrades of the convention, the coal miners of southern Illinois sent me here to see what the convention would do for them. They are organized already on what might be termed industrial lines, but they do not believe in "pure and simple" industrialism. Anybody that is acquainted with the United Mine Workers of America knows that all manner of men, miners and laborers, engineers and all, are in one union. But that is not what they want. They are ready and ripe for real revolutionary industrial unionism, and I can assure you that when I report back to them they will be wilder than ever to come to the Industrial Workers when they see that the working class of the industrial union is able to control its forces without intellectuals and grafters or would-be pure and simple industrial fakirs. Now, to show you how they stand they have been continually after me to organize them or to ask what were the Industrial Workers going to do for them, and requesting me to come to different places to address them on industrial unionism. I have gone to several places, Barrow, Muddy Valley, Elkville, Du Quoin, etc., and have addressed them. They have come after me and they offered to come every time I get any idle time, in buggies, etc., and take me over and bring me back. I have had a chart made on industrialism. I read the stenographic report of the other convention and I have been in touch with the Industrial Workers all along, and to show you that they are ripe, they requested me to organize them, and I sent out feelers to see how they stood. Here is one I sent out, and I said, "See how many you can get to sign this." I gave out seven or eight or ten of these lists and only requested them to get ten names, but sometimes those men would come in with forty. They read to the effect that having been sold out by labor fakirs and traitors in the union field they desired to join the new union. There were so many of these men that wanted to sign that paper that these men that I sent them to, especially Harry Henschel, got forty or more on his list. I only requested them to get ten. Others would get them, and still those names came right back in a very short time, less than a week. So that shows that they really want industrialism. We have a local union No. 98 of the United Mine Workers of America. There are 1,057 men that belong to that local. We took up a proposition that the local send a delegate here with power to install a local union. The local fakirs got hold of the communication and tore it up and would not let the men appear or let it be read before the union. This fakir that tore up this communication tried to vilify the Industrial Workers of the World, and I called him down on every statement that he made

so hard that they told me to remain and I could reply to him. I did so, and it brought down the house, or the rank and file. But they would not let them take any vote on a proposition of that kind because they claimed it was unconstitutional in the U. M. W. A. The rank and file, although they had been on strike and they were hard up and had no money, I have here over fifty names that contributed to send me here, all the way from five cents to five dollars, and I am to report back to them. I have run out of money and have to go home this morning, but I will assure you that if there is provision made for the coal miners you will find men throughout every coal region that will help carry the message, that will advertise when the organizers come into those fields. I don't know as it is necessary for me to take up any more of your time in making any kind of a speech. I am satisfied with the convention. I am well pleased with what has been done here, and it is not necessary for me to go over any of the ground or make any statements or use any words that would be superfluous. So I will take up no time in making a speech, but I will assure you that the coal miners in their struggles with the operators, with the experience that they have got, are as revolutionary a raw recruit as you will find in any part of the country. I am satisfied. I am going back home and I will say that the work of this convention is going to be well received by those men. If any of the comrades wish to ask me any questions I will answer them and then withdraw, thanking you and bidding you all good bye.

DEL. SCHWEINBURG: I would like to ask a question. Were you ever in Western Indiana?

MR. FRANCIS: No.

DEL. SCHWEINBURG: In Shelburn, Sullivan County?

MR. FRANCIS: No.

DEL. SCHWEINBURG: I will verify the statement so far as the coal miners of that part of the state are concerned. Last year—

THE CHAIRMAN: Bro. Schweinburg, the Chair will have to rule that you are out of order.

DEL. RIORDAN: I would like to have the brother leave his address with our acting secretary, if he has not already done so.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: He is a member at large.

MR. FRANCIS: I am a member at large of this organization.

DEL. LUNDY: I would like to ask the brother, under the present conditions that they are organized, is there anything to prevent the miners from coming in?

MR. FRANCIS: They have an agreement, that is the fakirs have an agreement with the coal operators from last April that was signed up for two years, and that is why the rank and file expects to have no more trouble with the coal operators, and they feel that they will be fully prepared for industrial unionism before their contract runs out. Now, in this agreement the only thing that binds them or holds them down to the fakirs is their employers. The men agree to have all dues and assessments paid or checked off before getting employment. That holds us to the United Mine Workers. If it were not for that they would not be able to hold that organization together, and before they have any trouble with the operators this next two years they feel that they are fully prepared and ready to go in the I. W. W. before they would have any further trouble with the coal operators.

DEL. LUNDY: Is it the understanding that if the United Mine Workers unite with the Industrial Workers of the World they will make some sort of disposition so that you will not have to pay regular dues until such time as that agreement runs out?

DEL. FRANCIS: I will say that they simply want to be in a position that they can organize before that two years is out, and when they are organized they will be able in less than six months to draw the majority to them. For instance, in my locality, Du Quoin, I don't think it would be three months till we would have a majority and that all the surrounding country would be in the I. W. W. They want to be placed in a position so that they can organize and feel that they will draw the majority quickly to the I. W. W., and having done so, they would have that bond broken and the operators would not dare to force those men on strike, because the coal miners as a class will not scab upon one another. It is the hardest proposition that you ever saw to get one coal miner to take another's place, and this so-called sacred agreement, if the operators would break that, the men immediately all over the country would consider that they were working under no agreement at all, and would be out that quick. (Snapping his fingers.) So what they want to do is to organize in some way, for they have no doubt but what they can win the majority in a very short time. In every place I go I find at least two men out of every three that are absolutely in favor of industrialism. In fact, there is really no opposition amongst the coal miners, except the few would-be fakirs and a few grafters that are doing their best to misconstrue or give a misunderstanding of what industrialism is. But it does not go with the rank and file, they are onto the fakirs; they realize that they have been faked and they realize that the men that have been telling them of this are the real industrialists, and the fakirs have lost their prestige with the rank and file throughout.

DEL. JOHNSON: I just rise for a question. The question I want to get at is this: I hear that the Industrial Workers of the World have paid very little attention to the coal field, and that they are sending a delegate to this convention with the view of interesting this convention in their affairs for the purpose of letting the convention know that the field is ripe for organization and that they desire that the Industrial Workers of the World pay some attention to them.

MR. FRANCIS: That is it.

DEL. JOHNSON: They feel that we ought to organize them?

MR. FRANCIS: They feel that they have been slighted to a certain extent by the Industrial Workers of the World.

A DELEGATE: By the G. E. B.

MR. FRANCIS: Well, yes, the G. E. B.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: I was down there.

MR. FRANCIS: There has been a right smart agitation, but it has been voluntary. It has been by the men that understood industrialism, who on their own hook went through this field, and they found that even the miners themselves that understood it had been agitating it, men that never did before, men of the rank and file; men that got the report of last year's convention, and so on. They are carrying the message and it is being accepted by the rank and file. Every place you go you will find some of those men that have carried the message to the rank and file, and the rank and file have been watching and to a certain extent have been in touch with the Industrial Workers of the World through getting last year's stenographic report of the convention.

DEL. RYAN: I would like to ask the delegate this, if during what little agitation has been going on among the coal miners of Illinois they never made application to the Department of Mining Industry for a charter; if they had any correspondence with them or anything that

way indicating what was the attitude of the Western Federation of Miners toward them.

MR. FRANCIS: Well, I don't know that they have directly, but there are parts of the field whereby the capitalist press we were informed that they were turned down by the Western Federation of Miners, but didn't know what for; and they asked me and I told them that they were not turned down only in this light, as I thought, that the Industrial Workers of the World did not want to do anything that would cause any hardship upon the rank and file, and probably they thought it best to wait a while.

DEL. RYAN: What I want to get at specifically is this: Do you know of any correspondence with the Western Federation of Miners, for instance, that would indicate what was their attitude towards the coal miners?

MR. FRANCIS: I will say that I did not correspond with anybody else or for anybody else.

DEL. RYAN: I just wanted to ask that. It would be up to the General Executive Board of the Industrial Workers of the World to give a charter and for an organizer to go in there or anything of that nature.

MR. FRANCIS: I did not myself, because I thought Comrades Cox and Veal being coal miners, they were more capable and understood the conditions as well as I did. I don't know what anybody else did, but I am informed that Comrade Cox was in communication with the Western Federation.

DEL. MARKLEY: I would like to ask a question of information, through either the brothers from the Western Federation of Miners or the General Secretary-Treasurer, if there have been any applications for a charter sent to the G. E. B. or the Western Federation of Miners that were refused, or whether there have been any communications from either the Illinois miners, the Eastern Ohio or the Western Pennsylvania miners; because I know from personal experience that those men have conditions there about the same.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair will have to rule that when you ask your question you cannot make a speech.

DEL. LINGENFELTER: I would like to ask a question.

THE CHAIRMAN: Wait till Markley's question is answered.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: I do not think it is proper to bring that matter up now. There were communications exchanged between the Mining Department and the general office, and the information received in the last letter was that the Mining Department will charter mine workers provided they come in districts; that the agitation in all others should be continued.

DEL. LINGENFELTER: I have a question and it is this: if a sub-district or a district, as the Springfield district, were to pull out and join the Mining Department of the I. W. W., thereby of course doing away with the check-off, in your opinion are the theories of some of our brothers in Western Pennsylvania correct when they believe the miners belonging to the U. M. W. would go over and scab on their fellow workers who refuse to pay their check-off and join the Industrial Workers?

MR. FRANCIS: I would say that I am almost positive that they would not. There are two so-called scab mines in Southern Illinois close to Du Quoin where I live, the Leiter property and the Brush. The Brush Mines are what you might term an open mine. It makes no difference whether you are a union man or whether you ain't, you can get work there with these men. But the owner has found out it was not profitable to try to run a mine of that kind. Leiter is a kind



of a Dutchman: it seems through personal malice of his own he is trying to run his mine, but I am satisfied he is losing money every day. He brings men from the far East, that don't understand the English language. They misrepresent things to them. They bring them in there and after they get them in there, to a certain extent they have told me that they were held in captivity, that is that they were held in there and they would pay when pay-day came and they would pay them monthly, etc., or whenever they got ready. Well, when pay-day came they would find out that they had been charged with rent, water, etc., and they have got nothing coming.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair will rule that you cannot go into the Leiter matter now.

DEL. LINGENFELTER: No, but then I know a man who rode with a carload of them that left there and were going back, and if they could have got hold of Leiter they would have murdered him, to tell the truth about it. A number of them went back. He has exploited the men so that they will leave immediately when they find out the situation; so they cannot keep men on those conditions. I am most positive that should any part of the miners in any district leave the United Mine Workers they would not only not take those men's places but they themselves would fall in line with the men that made the break.

DEL. SIMS: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the delegate is he familiar around about Danville and southern Illinois, Rushville, etc., where negro mines are pretty extensively situated, and do you know of any agitation going on among them towards getting them into the Industrial Workers of the World?

MR. FRANCIS: Only my town. There half the coal miners are white, so half or almost half of Du Quoin are colored miners. In some places under the United Mine Workers they are discriminated against.

THE CHAIRMAN: Del. Sims asked about Danville, if you know anything about that.

MR. FRANCIS: No, I don't know anything about Danville.

DEL. SIMS: And about the negro miners?

MR. FRANCIS: These colored fellows wherever I meet them in my town are also for industrialism, and they have put up as hard a fight against graft as the white fellows have, almost. That is, they are for the real thing, although they have been discriminated against under the United Mine Workers. In some places they are in the United Mine Workers, but in some places they are not allowed to work. That is one thing that they are opposed to the United Mine Workers for, and they realize it is a fake and they are for the Industrial Workers, because they have not been treated with a brotherly spirit and have been discriminated against by the United Mine Workers.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegates, I think the matter is well understood by the delegates at this time, and the time has long since passed that the brother was granted the floor for.

DEL. COX: I don't want to ask a question, but I simply want to call the delegates' attention to the resolution that I put in here, and when that resolution comes up then I want the floor.

THE CHAIRMAN: All right. Bro. Fox, take the chair. The Constitution Committee will resume.

(Delegate Fox took the chair.)

#### CONSTITUTION COMMITTEE.

DEL. McKNIGHT: I would like to ask the Constitution Committee a question about a resolution that I presented. I presented a resolution signed by myself and two colleagues relating to Article III, but

since the committee in their report have already gone past that portion I wish to inquire whether the resolution was considered by the committee in its session.

DEL. KINNEALLY: I do not remember now.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: I would think that would be out of order while the committee is reading its report.

DEL. McKNIGHT: I bring the matter up because they have already gone past Section 3 and I have heard no mention of my resolution, and I wish to know the fate of it.

DEL. DE LEON: Mr. Chairman, I may be able to explain to Del. McKnight that the Committee on Constitution did not go through the constitution section by section. It was compelled to take proposals as they came along, and consequently, while I do not recall what proposition he specifically brought before us—

DEL. McKNIGHT: I can read it if you want.

DEL. DE LEON: While I do not recall the circumstances as to the different sections and what was proposed to be amended, it seems to me that is not anything we have acted upon.

DEL. McKNIGHT: Since that portion has already been passed I have good reason to suppose that you will not take any action on that now, since you have passed it.

DEL. DE LEON: I just stated that we have not gone through the constitution section by section. We took up the amendments as they were proposed and handled those amendments and reserved to ourselves afterwards the right to go through the various propositions the same as we did at first.

DEL. McKNIGHT: I am to understand, then, that my resolution will be brought up and considered at some later time by the committee?

DEL. DE LEON: That is my understanding. I do not now recall what the purport of your resolution was.

DEL. McKNIGHT: I have it here.

DEL. DE LEON: It does not matter. It will certainly be reported upon.

DEL. McKNIGHT: Very well. That is the point I wished to bring out.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The committee will continue.

DEL. KINNEALLY: In addition to Section 4, Article II, "Duties of General Secretary," we add: "He shall furnish a copy of all proceedings to each affiliated local union, regardless of their affiliation if any with any of the departments of the Industrial Workers of the World."

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: You have heard the committee's recommendation.

Delegate Markley moved to concur. Seconded.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: It is regularly moved and seconded that we concur in this report of the committee.

DEL. SCHWEINBURG: I do not understand thoroughly. Is it the proceedings of the General Executive Board, or what proceedings are referred to?

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The delegates will keep quiet, and Del. Kinneally will read that section again.

Del. Kinneally again read the section.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Now, it has been regularly moved and seconded that the convention concur. Any remarks?

DEL. RICHTER: What proceedings?

DEL. SHENKAN: Did I understand by that it implies the proceedings of the convention and the proceedings of the General Executive Board as well and the Local Executive Board?

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The committee will give the information.

DEL. KINNEALLY: You certainly ought to know above anybody else, because it is by your introduction.

DEL. SHENKAN: All right, I want it understood that way. That is the reason I asked the question.

DEL. KINNEALLY: Yes, that is the meetings of the General Executive Board.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Any further remarks?

DEL. SIMS: Does that mean that all of Section 4 shall remain intact and only this part that he read off be added to it?

A DELEGATE: Yes.

DEL. SIMS: The part where it says that they shall be signed with the signature of the General President, what are you going to do with that?

A DELEGATE: They are official documents.

DEL. DE LEON: That will be taken up later.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Yes, that will necessarily be taken up later. Any further remarks? If not, we will go to the question.

DEL. PARKS: Let us have it read.

A DELEGATE: I move its unanimous adoption.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: It will be read once more.

The section was again read.

DEL. McMULLEN: Do I understand that that will be placed as a paragraph at the bottom of page 10? Is that where it comes in at?

DEL. KINNEALLY: Well, it would go in on page 10. The Committee on Style will probably place it in its proper place. I have got it placed at the last part of that section.

DEL. McMULLEN: I understand that this is proposed as an addition to this article.

DEL. MARKLEY: Yes.

DEL. McMULLEN: I want to be recorded as voting against it.

DEL. HALL: I want to ask that that complete section as amended, after we have adopted the amendment, will be read and afterwards adopted as a whole.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: That, I believe, is the understanding.

DEL. PARKS: I want to ask, is it the purpose of this amendment to place before the rank and file the doings of the General Executive Board?

DELEGATES: Yes.

A DELEGATE: As well as the convention.

DEL. PARKS: I want to go on record as in favor of that.

DEL. McMULLEN: There is one word I might say, and it is this: This is a question of principle here. The idea is this: Under the section you will give the General Secretary-Treasurer the authority to directly, by circular or otherwise, go right into the locals of any department. Now, I want to say that there is not any provision in the present constitution for the General Secretary-Treasurer to reach the locals of departments only through the departments, whereas you propose to go in and destroy that. You say we have autonomy in the departments, and still you are going to put this pernicious doctrine in here and destroy all there is of it. We of your Department of Mining readily conceive what you are doing, and it is for that reason that I am going to vote against this. If you will submit this to the departments and then from them to their locals I have no objection, because you would not destroy their autonomy, but I can see that this is an attempt to destroy every department there is, and it is for that reason that I want to cast my vote against this idea. I don't believe in a

one-man czar. You talk about your officialdom, and I object to the czar business. I would not be a party to creating a czar, and that is what you do here.

DEL. DE LEON: Mr. Chairman, the issue before us is not the issue which Del. McMullen pretends to raise.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Keep quiet. Proceed.

DEL. DE LEON: The issue is not to build up a czar, but the issue is to prevent the establishment of petty independencies, of petty czars. The issue that presents itself before us is the issue that the government of these United States was confronted with in the matter of state rights, when every state presumed to go it independent of the central administration. The issue raised by Del. McMullen is an echo from the grave dug at Appomatox, when state rights went down once for all and this country was pronounced one nation. Del. McMullen misstates the fact when he says that we give the department complete autonomy, that this constitution does. That is not the first time that Del. McMullen has shown that he has not read the constitution. The constitution says, in Section 2 A of Article I, that "the sub-division national and international unions shall have autonomy in their respective internal affairs, provided the General Executive Board shall have power to control these industrial unions in matters concerning the interest of the general welfare." It is a long-established principle that interpretation of a document demands the interpretation of all its parts; that no interpretation of one part or one word that annuls another part or another word may stand. The interpretation put upon the constitution by Del. McMullen annuls that clause which I have just read and upon which for the last two weeks he has been swearing and to which he had been swearing allegiance previously as an upholder of the constitution. Now, since the General Executive Board has general supervision it means that there is a qualified autonomy. As I stated to this body on a previous occasion, I hesitate to call up the name of Haywood because I object to the sympathy racket. But let us forget that Haywood is in jail; let us remember who Haywood is and who Haywood was at the last national convention. Open the stenographic report which this element did its level best to squelch and failed, and you will find the repeated statement on the part of the president or chairman of that convention, William D. Haywood, that this is to be a government not of departments but of the rank and file. He objected to a president that was to be the chief guy. He objected to departmental work. He joined in the view which I have stated that the departments so-called must be in the nature of the states of the United States and that there should be no less and no more autonomy, and for the same reason that this government of the United States is not a government of states but a government of the people, for the same reason the government of this I. W. W. is not a government of departments; it is a government of the rank and file. Moreover, if you turn over to the Manifesto, along the line of which we hewed so close and allowed neither extremists nor reactionists to cause us to swerve, that Manifesto clearly speaks about the autonomy that should prevail, namely, in internal matters that do not concern others, and it refers to working class unity. A working class unity cannot be maintained in the I. W. W. if the head of any department has it in his power to exclude from the rank and file the actions of the G. E. B. of the whole body. If the governor of a state or the legislature of a state had the power to keep information away from the rank and file of the state as to what occurs, you can imagine what would be the result, and that was just what was wanted by the element who figured at that time, and who are here, an echo of the grave through McMullen's and others' mouths; the element that wanted that no law passed by

the congress should reach the rank and file unless it went through the state authorities, and a long struggle prevailed upon that. We had the nullification turmoil; we had the Aaron Burr who attempted rebellion; and we finally had the conflict that put an end to it. Now I maintain that this bourgeois history is the pedestal on which we stand. Revolution does not mean to break off with the past. We are children of the past, and what we are laboring for here upon the industrial field the bourgeois capitalists have established before us upon the political field. The political field dividing us into states; the industrial field proposing to remove state distinctions and establish the industries on a newer basis such as working class unity, working class solidarity, such as the Preamble demanded, under the terms of which that convention was held and by the light of which that convention guided its actions. It is not contended that a McMullen or anybody else in any department has within himself the power to say what shall go to the rank and file or not; that is what is happening in Gompers' concern. The I. W. W. was formed honestly. It was not intended to be a cheat upon the working class, it was not intended to palm off upon them the old A. F. of L. racket in a new shape. It was intended to be a new thing upon the lines that capitalist development compels; so that this clause means just what it says. The actions of the G. E. B. shall be brought before the rank and file of each organization, and while the industrial unions must have autonomy in their private affairs—in affairs such as are properly private they are to have autonomy—the autonomy is destroyed absolutely upon matters of general concern, and nobody can deny that the actions of the G. E. B., the General Executive Board of the whole organization, are matters that interest the rank and file. It may be that the rank and file may not care to read it; that is their fault; but they must be given an opportunity to find out. You can take a horse to water, but you can't make him drink. We propose to take the water to the horse and not allow anybody to stand in the way as we know has been attempted in this organization.

DEL. MOORE: I want a point of information. Do I understand that Article I with all these sections is adopted by this body or that we pass over that and adopt Article II?

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The Chair understands that only those clauses are adopted that have been read here.

DEL. MOORE: The amendments.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Yes.

DEL. MOORE: That section of the article was adopted as amended?

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Will the committee answer that?

DEL. DE LEON: Our action has been on—and nothing has been adopted except—the amendments that have been proposed.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: That is my understanding also.

DEL. DE LEON: The amendments that have been proposed. We have not been able to proceed any other way. There have been too many propositions before the committee to proceed.

DEL. PARKS: May I ask Bro. De Leon a question, to resolve a doubt in my mind? Didn't I understand that those things that are not rejected in the present constitution stand?

DEL. DE LEON: Well, when we get through; when we get through.

DEL. PARKS: When we get through?

DEL. DE LEON: When we get through and not before.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Any further discussion?

DEL. FITZGERALD: I would like to know whether there are two meetings held in this hall or not, and if there is a chairman down here. I would like to know why this meeting is going on in this corner. I ask as a delegate that came to this convention to listen here to what

is going on, that these men will get up and take the floor in regular order, and that there be no discussion in this corner. We are here as delegates—

A DELEGATE: Sit down.

DEL. FITZGERALD: You can't put me down.

A DELEGATE: And you can't put me down.

DEL. FITZGERALD: This is the Chair, and I am speaking to the Chair.

DEL. McDONALD: I rise to a point of order. There is nothing going on in this corner at all. He can get all the satisfaction he wants if he wants it out of me.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The Chair will rule that members must keep order.

DEL. HALL: I would like to ask information from the committee. The resolution which the committee has just offered for us to vote upon is a magnificent thing in its spirit. Now I would like to ask the committee if they have made any special arrangements for carrying out the spirit of this resolution. I will state the situation in a few words. As I understand it, there is no connection between the locals in an organized department and the General Secretary-Treasurer direct. All communications, whether the constitution says so or not, must pass through the officialdom of the department; that is he has no other way of reaching the local; he has no roster of the locals except what they furnish, or bring with them; I mean the General Secretary of the Mining Department. If he wants to furnish a roster of the locals of that department to the General Secretary he does so of his own free will; there is no constitutional enactment at all. Now, that resolution will fall flat and the purpose will fall flat unless there is provision made by which the General Secretary does get in contact with the locals of those departments. I want to ask the committee whether they have considered that matter or not. It seems to me it is important in connection with this.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: A question is asked of the committee. Do you wish to answer it?

DEL. DE LEON: I will say for the committee that if we were to enact a special rule for every act which is obviously necessary we would then have a book double the size of the Revised Statutes of the United States. All that we can do in the limited time at our disposal and in the limited way we do our work is to legislate on certain central and general principles and rely for the present upon the mutual good will of the membership to insist upon the sub-regulation that the central principles demand. And a principle such as this, that the actions of the G. E. B. shall be sent to every local, the principle which implies that every local is thereby practically brought in the presence of the meetings of the G. E. B.—that principle being established, if this principle is adopted the rest follows—it follows absolutely; and in what manner it shall be done, that we left to the experience of our membership for future conventions to decide.

DEL. MOORE: I believe with Del. De Leon that the affairs of the General Executive Board should be placed before the membership as we actually did, and this annexation to this paragraph there on page 6 provides for that, but unless there is some way to get back of Article I, Section 2, I can't vote for it. Unless there is some way to get back of Article I, Section 2, and get that one word "complete" out of there I cannot vote for it because it is a contradiction in terms. If some one will make this clear to me then I will vote for it. It says "The subdivisions, international, or national"—I believe that was amended to "industrial unions"—"shall have complete industrial autonomy."

Then it says "in their respective internal affairs, provided the General Executive Board shall have power to control these industrial unions in matters concerning the interest of the general welfare." Now, if some one on this floor will explain to me how a department can have complete industrial autonomy and still the General Executive Board can override that industrial autonomy with that word "complete" in there, then I will vote yes.

DEL. McMULLEN: Bro. DeLeon naturally knowing all that is in the constitution, will tell us what that is—that is the section that I refer to.

DEL. PINKERTON: Mr. Chairman—

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: A question has been asked of the committee: Will you state that question again?

DEL. McMULLEN: The brother read the law over to us. I have suspected that being the law, and Bro. DeLeon took the floor and in his talk talked about the war, the civil war, and everything of that sort, but he didn't tell us what this law was in there. I knew it was in there, although I am ignorant of the constitution. Now, I want him to explain how the constitution gives complete autonomy—mind you, complete autonomy. Now, then, tell us these things.

DEL. DE LEON: All I can do is to repeat what I stated. That contained the interpretation I would put on it.

DEL. McMULLEN: Tell us what that means here, "within a department."

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: I hold that question is out of order.

DEL. DE LEON: I stated clearly that the charitable view was that the gentleman was ignorant of the constitution, because of holding the interpretation. What he says is strong confirmation. It is owing to ignorance of the constitution that he says the constitution provides for complete autonomy. The constitution proceeds to say "in their respective internal affairs." They have complete industrial autonomy in their respective internal affairs. He who does not read those words is not aware of what the constitution contains. I will venture further to say that the clause proceeds to give the General Executive Board power to control the industrial unions in matters concerning the interests of the general welfare. In matters concerning internal affairs, matters therefore that cannot concern the general welfare, they have complete autonomy and the constitution so says. In matters concerning the general welfare they have no such autonomy, and if anybody chose to give to the word "complete" the interpretation that McMullen and Moore did, that is their business; I can not counteract the effect of their mental action. It gives complete autonomy, and it states complete in what.

DEL. MOORE: I asked for information and I have got it.

DEL. MOSKOVITZ: I want to state that I am not an intellectual, nor am I much of a parliamentarian, and although I have had but little schooling by night or day, I at least know how much is necessary to a full sentence. That some brothers mention this complete autonomy shows to me that they do not catch the sentence. The sentence ends there where the period is, and Bro. DeLeon has covered that ground very well. Now I say we have had all the discussion on the question and all the information necessary for our enlightenment, and I think we could proceed to a vote. I would move, then, the previous question.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: You made a speech and are disqualified.

DEL. SHENKAN: I call for the previous question.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The previous question has been moved and seconded.

A DELEGATE: Unanimous consent.

DEL. McDONALD: I move that the previous question be laid on the table.

DEL. McMULLEN: I second the motion.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: It has been moved and seconded that the previous question be laid on the table. The roll will be called. I would take it by this resolution you lay the committee's report on the table, that is the report on this clause.

A DELEGATE: No, the previous question.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: That is the previous question.

DEL. PARKS: I rise to a point of order. There was a motion made for the previous question.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: All right.

DEL. PARKS: The delegate here made a motion to lay the previous question on the table. Laying the previous question on the table don't affect the amendment to the constitution, and your ruling is wrong.

DEL. McMULLEN: Bro. Parks ain't like some of us. My brother wants some information so that he may vote intelligently. I am ready to receive information at any time and all hours in the future at the hands of Bro. DeLeon and his followers that we can get. I think we ought to continue this discussion.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: If it is so understood that we only lay the motion "That the previous question be now put" on the table I will put it that way.

DEL. SHENKAN: In order to save time I withdraw my previous question. This is merely a game to delay us.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Let the Chair explain what you can do. If the motion only applies to the motion "That the main question be now put" it simply calls for two roll calls, that is all.

A DELEGATE: Unanimous consent.

DEL. AUGUSTINE: A point of information. If the mover of the previous question withdraws it and the seconder does so also, that does away with tabling that motion.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Certainly, and the motion to concur is now before the house.

DEL. AUGUSTINE: Exactly.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The motion to table the previous question is carried by consent. Then the motion to concur is before the house. Are there are any further remarks? Are you ready for the roll call? (Question called for.) Call the roll.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: This is on the adoption of the report?

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: On the adoption of the report by the committee read just now. If you vote Yes you will adopt the report of the committee as just read. If you vote No you vote against it.

DEL. McDONALD: I would like to ask a question. Suppose that is carried, the department will have no more autonomy?

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Oh, no, that is not a fact. The Secretary has simply the right to send out reports to the various locals, all of them, whether attached to a department or not.

DEL. McDONALD: In the department.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: That is right. It is plain enough. You all understand it. Now let us call the roll.

DEL. MAHONEY: A point of information. I would like to have the amendment read again so that I may vote intelligently.

The amendment was again read by Secretary Kinneally.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Now call the roll.

DEL. McMULLEN: I claim that it destroys the departmental organization.



THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Let us have the roll; you all understand it.

Delegate St. John resumed the chair.

The roll was taken and resulted: Total vote, 566; Yes, 341; No, 225.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is carried. The committee will proceed to read.

#### REPRESENTATION OF LOCALS.

DEL. KINNEALLY: Addition to Article VI: "No local shall be admitted to representation unless it has been duly chartered at least three months before the call for the convention and it is otherwise in good standing."

DEL. SHENKAN: I move its adoption. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been regularly moved and seconded that the clause just read be adopted. You have heard the motion; are you ready for the question?

DEL. McMULLEN: What clause is that?

THE CHAIRMAN: It is a new section to Article VI.

DEL. McMULLEN: That will be placed at the end.

DEL. KINNEALLY: It certainly will.

DEL. McMULLEN: Won't that interfere with some section in here that gives locals the right to come in at the present time?

THE CHAIRMAN: It amends that. It will amend it if there is anything existing there.

DEL. McMULLEN: Bro. St. John, don't you think we ought to specify that in there?

THE CHAIRMAN: We specify that later on. That is a part of the Committee on Style's work.

DEL. McMULLEN: Then this amendment is not complete, by the decision.

THE CHAIRMAN: The amendment is complete, yes. Are you ready for the question? (Question called for.)

DEL. McMULLEN: I want to speak on the merits of the matter. I never heard it read before. I may have misunderstood it at the time of reading. I understood that a local that is not three months in arrears is in good standing. Is that true?

THE CHAIRMAN: No.

DEL. McMULLEN: And at the same time right here you say that a local that is not chartered 90 days prior to the date set for holding the convention—any local chartered within three months—can not go in. That as I understand is the proposition we are about to vote upon. Well, then, there will be three months of every year that the organization by its organic law will simply be absolutely dead. It can not grow because if it did grow it cannot get recognition by the organization which it attaches itself to. I want to compliment the wonderful brain that conceived that idea that for nine months this organization could grow and then for three months it must stand suspended, because if it did it would not acquire any rights by so doing. I want to compliment the gentleman that introduced that thing. It calls for my most profound admiration. I suppose in my blissful state of ignorance that I cannot comprehend the greatest production—

THE CHAIRMAN: Del. McMullen, will you please confine yourself to the question before the house?

DEL. McMULLEN: I had an idea I was. You see, my brain is not like other brains, and you see I have to speak as the ideas come forth. Now, there may be benefits in this thing that I don't see. I am frank in saying this, that if this organization is to be a live, acting, going-ahead proposition there is not one single day in the whole entire year

that it should be prevented from growing. If it is dead, then I say, gentlemen, let it die the whole entire twelve months instead of three. Don't virtually sit here and suspend men who would willingly join you in those ninety days, from participating in the convention, by saying "If you come in any of these three months you can't sit with us." I am against that proposition. I see no necessity for it. I believe in the intelligence of the intellectual people in this organization. I admit I am not of them; but I am trying to learn. Now, this is a day-school and I am cheerfully and willingly giving my time and attention, and, honestly, I can't get it into my numskull what you are trying to do. I know you have got something more there that is good, but bless the Lord, I can't see where it is at.

DEL. PARKS: Bro. McMullen's position—

DEL. McMULLEN: Now, I want you to leave the "s" off. It is just McMullen, and not McMullens.

DEL. PARKS: I beg your pardon.

DEL. McMULLEN: Thank you.

DEL. PARKS: But I have to be governed by the rules of English grammar that say your name is McMullen's in the possessive. (Laughter.)

DEL. McMULLEN: Now, Mr. President, I don't possess a thing.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is the opinion of the Chair that if Del. Parks will confine himself to the motion he won't be interrupted.

DEL. PARKS: Bro. McMullen's position upon this floor is all based upon the hypothesis that the whole purpose of the labor movement is to have conventions to which they will send delegates at so much per. That that is the alpha and omega of the labor movement seems to be the basis of his argument that he has brought forth here, that we are to give these locals recognition or no recognition. It is a strange argument. I will tell you the idea, and it is well that it should be incorporated in the stenographic report. It is for the purpose of having this proposition in the constitution so that there will not be any state organizers that will go out and organize fake locals under the banner of the I. W. W. and present fake Daniel McKinnon cases before the future conventions of the Industrial Workers of the World. That is the reason this was brought forth here.

DEL. MCKINNON: A point of order. Bro. Parks has designated my local as a fake local. Now, he was just as much in favor of faking, as he voted for the fakirs.

DEL. PARKS: I will state my position to the convention and I will rest on the verdict of this convention whether I was in favor of fakirs or not.

THE CHAIRMAN: Discuss the motion.

DEL. PARKS: All right. He says we are going to stop and the organization of the I. W. W. is going to stagnate.

DEL. SIMS: A point of order. If we are going to have a cross-fire debating proposition, it looks like it is a waste of energy and time. I hold that both gentlemen are out of order in cross-firing to each other.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair will rule that your point is well taken.

DEL. SCHWEINBURG: I would like to have Bro. Kinneally read again the paragraph of the constitution.

The section was again read.

DEL. SCHWEINBURG: I cannot understand what Bro. McMullen bases his statement upon. He says here six months prior to the convention, and now he has got it three months prior to the convention. According to his statement it would be half a year, but it is only a quarter of a year.

DEL. McMULLEN: I am only referring to locals chartered, and not to dues paid under the old constitution.

DEL. TULLAR: I don't want to take up time with an amendment, but I wish to suggest that this be worded to read: "three months prior to the convention," so that amendments may be sent out a month or six weeks before the convention, which would make the local have to be chartered and in good standing five or six months prior to the convention. I think the wording of it should be "three months prior to the convention."

DEL. AUGUSTINE: The way I understand this clause it simply qualifies the locals. The way we have it at present an organization is entitled to representation and its representation is based on the national dues paid to the organization for the last six months, which this does not change. The last call was from February 1st to July 31st. Now, if I understand this clause correctly a local has to be chartered three months before July 31st in order to come within the provision. That is the way I understand this clause; so that the six months are within the call of the convention, and in no other way.

DEL. DUNCAN: I want a point of information before I vote. I want to know if there is any provision in the constitution otherwise that provides for the time of making the call for a convention? If this is not provided for it leaves a power in the hands of the G.E.B. which we do not need to leave there. Otherwise if this is not provided for I would want to make an amendment to this motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair will answer your question, Bro. Duncan, by stating that this is provided for in the constitution.

DEL. DUNCAN: By what authority, now?

DEL. FISCHER: Section Seven.

DEL. DUNCAN: Bro. Chairman, that would leave a period of five months between the convention, and the date that the locals must be in good standing in order to elect delegates.

DEL. DE LEON: I wish to call the attention of Del. Duncan to the fact that the clause as it stands, Section 7 of Article VI, to which reference has been made, was enacted when the convention was to take place in May. There is a provision, a section, that says that matters in conflict with the amendments shall be eliminated. Now, this would come under that head, I think. That is to say, on the 7th day of March the call must issue when the rule was to hold the convention in May—March and April, that would be one month and twenty days. It would follow that since the convention is now to be held on the third Monday in September of each year the call must be issued the same length of time before the convention, and it would be July 10th. Nevertheless, I realize that this is an amendment that would go beyond perhaps the province of the Committee on Style, and we recommend that Del. Duncan or anyone else present a recommendation to the Committee on Constitution which will act upon it specifically and which will cover it. The spirit of this is obvious.

(Question called for.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Unless there is objection, unless any delegate desires it otherwise, the Chair will rule that this is adopted unanimously.

DEL. McMULLEN: I desire to be recorded in the negative.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will have a roll call, then.

DEL. McMULLEN: I don't want to have a roll call.

DEL. TULLAR: I desire to be recorded no.

THE CHAIRMAN: There are other delegates. Call the roll.

The roll was called as far as the name of Kleese.

DEL. KLEESE: Mr. Chairman, I want a little more information

on this. Does this mean that locals have to be chartered three months before the convention comes to order or four months and twenty days?

DEL. DE LEON: Four months and twenty days.

DEL. KLEESE: Then I am opposed.

The roll was called and resulted: Total vote, 575; Yes, 330; No, 245.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is carried. The secretary will proceed to read.

#### DUAL MEMBERSHIP.

DEL. KINNEALLY: Practically a new section, new article. "No member of one industrial or trade organization can at the same time hold a card in another industrial or trade organization." That will have to be placed by the engrossing committee, or the committee on style. It is a new article.

DEL. SCHWEINBURG: A point of information. I understand this is a new article of the constitution. But I think the Constitution Committee made a great mistake in not presenting the constitution as it should be and going ahead from one section to another.

DEL. KLEESE: I move its adoption. Seconded.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is moved and seconded that the clause just read by the secretary of the Constitution Committee be adopted as read. You have heard the motion; are you ready for the question? (Question called for.)

DEL. TULLAR: I do not know that I thoroughly understand the meaning of that proposition, but if I am correct it means that a man cannot belong to the Industrial Workers of the World or to another trade union or craft union at the same time. Am I wrong?

THE CHAIRMAN: No; within the organization.

DEL. TULLAR: I stand corrected.

DEL. SIMS: Haven't we had that proposition before?

THE CHAIRMAN: No, only in so far as mixed locals are concerned; that is all.

DEL. SIMS: Didn't we vote on that same proposition yesterday?

THE CHAIRMAN: That was only in defining the membership of mixed locals yesterday. This is defining the membership of all locals.

DEL. DUNCAN: Bro. Chairman, there is a little room for doubt in the minds of some when they read this amendment as proposed, although I know the Constitution Committee did not contemplate it when they made it. Some working men may read that and think that it means that they can not belong to an industrial union of the I. W. W. and an A. F. of L. trade union at the same time. I am sure the committee did not intend anything of that kind, but in order to preclude the possibility of that misunderstanding arising I move you that we amend that resolution or section so as to insert the words "of the I. W. W."; "Cannot belong to an industrial union and trade union of the I. W. W. at the same time."

DEL. DE LEON: I second that motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded that we insert the words "of the I. W. W." in the resolution offered by the Constitution Committee. You have heard this amendment.

DELEGATES: Unanimous.

THE CHAIRMAN: If there are no objections it will be accepted.

DEL. HESLEWOOD: Before you pass that—I am not going to stand in the way of passing it—I would like to be clear. Take the case where a man working in a western mine acts as an organizer in other towns. I myself and others act as organizers. We join the mixed local and stay in the town for a time. We join it with a view to giving it a good

start and stay in it a few months, and when the time comes we pull out. I don't know but that amendment would shut me out.

DEL. FRENCH: That question of Del. Heslewood has been already settled in the matter of mixed locals. I want to know if this question now isn't this way: John J. Kinneally, while he is holding a card in Local 28, Transportation Department, if he were to quit his job on the New Haven road and go to work as a carpenter or electrical worker and then join the building trade industrial union, couldn't any longer retain his card in Local 28. He simply would have to transfer to the building trade industrial union and quit Local 28. That is all that means. Isn't that the sense of it?

DEL. KINNEALLY: That is the sense of it.

DEL. TULLAR: I do not object to that, but I want this simply put out in language that the reader cannot misinterpret. Otherwise it might be misinterpreted by the worker that happened to read it, and I want it put out in language that no man can mistake.

Del. Kinneally again read the section, including "I. W. W.."

DEL. TULLAR: That is right.

DEL. DE LEON: As to what Del. Tullar says, it is simply impossible to frame a constitution in such a way that every single person who gives little thought to the subject will understand it correctly; but we must make the best effort we can to diminish the number who might misunderstand it. For that reason I as a member of the Constitution Committee accepted the suggestion of Del. Duncan. I can see how there might be a word on which someone might hang a doubt. The illustration of Del. Kinneally is correct, but I want to give a correct idea of the theory upon which the committee proceeded. If you remember there was an extensive part of the ex-president's report upon the subject of the musicians. You remember when the musicians' delegate appeared on the floor the ex-president took the floor and spoke extensively upon the difficulties that confronted them. The same thing with regard to the General Secretary-Treasurer. Now, the official organ of the musicians recently issued in New York contained information that was new to me, although I do not accept the statement of some folks that I have only the theory of things and have no practical knowledge. Upon the subject of the musicians I have that actual knowledge, though gained from their own official organ, and it is this, that they systematically hold cards in two unions. The case of Del. Kinneally shows that a man may work in one department, who is not going to keep on in the other except incidentally, till he determines whether he is going to be permanent, because it is a second or adopted calling. But in the case of the musicians it seems to be a systematic regulation, the habitual way. A musician may be a blacksmith; he may be a waiter; he may be a cigar maker; he may be almost anything, and he works at that during the day and he has his card in the local of that occupation. In the evening, since he has some musical talent, he wants to earn a few nickels besides. He then joins the musical union and he takes out a card in that union. He thereupon is a member in two unions. The union of blacksmiths, waiters, cigar makers, or whatever it may be in which he earns the bulk of his living, sends delegates here and the musical union to which he also belongs also sends delegates. That man has a double representation. That sort of thing is a source of corruption. That sort of thing invites the disharmony that you will find always existing wherever musicians have an organization in a central body—a disharmony that strikes the onlooker who does not know those facts and gives rise to the question, "How can an organization that promotes music be the means of disharmonies in a central body?" And the secret was revealed to me by that disclosure that there are

members of these other occupations who have incidental trades and consequently follow two callings, with the result that we know. That is to be changed. Our ex-G. E. B. found themselves tangled up through that fact. That is at the bottom of this double situation in which we find ourselves. It may be that some organizations will have trouble, but I think although difficulties may arise from it, greater advantages will flow. Del. Schomberg of the musicians who was put on that committee heard my statement, just what I am telling you here, and he thought that the G. E. B. might propose something. I thought the contrary; that the proposition to clear up that situation should come from the musicians themselves. They know about it; they know how they are situated, and a proposition should come to the G. E. B. by which such a thing may be avoided without interfering with the musicians' union if possible. I do not know how it can be done, but I understand it can be done under the new G. E. B. This clause is an eminently wise clause, and will avoid disharmony in the future.

DEL. SCHOMBERG: I spoke to the committee and they examined it to the best of their ability. As far as that is concerned I think they will have no trouble. But since I have been here I have found in this city especially that numbers of the I. W. W. also belong to the Federation and could not work. I believe this clause would be some remedy for that thing, so that members should not belong to two organizations, one outside and one inside. I think that men that have the principles of the I. W. W. in their hearts could not be associated with any other.

DEL. PARKS: I think Brother De Leon's argument brings forth very cogent reasons as to this question. I believe it is wrong for men to have double representation and a double voice in this organization, and I believe where an individual is following an incidental occupation as this musical occupation is regarded by a great many, that we ought not to do anything to discourage an organization within that occupation, and I believe we should issue a card covering each one of those occupations, and we can get around it in this way, that we could issue what would be known as a limited card; that is, he would have the right to select which union he is going to ask for representation through in the general administration and a right to a vote and representation in the conventions, but his limited card would only be a card that he held signifying that he follows an incidental occupation, and he can elect whether he is going to have a card entitling him to a voice through a given organization in the general administration, or which one he would take. The incidental card would only be a pass card. I make that suggestion to get around the difficulty.

DEL. SIMS: Mr. Chairman, I want to get a little better understanding on this card proposition as related to the musicians. Now, the man who follows an avocation different from the musicians' and who carries a card in this particular craft or trade, and he is also a member of the musicians' organization—do I understand that this resolution is to debar this man from having a voice and vote in this musicians' organization in which he takes a card any time when they need his services? Or is it a question whether this fellow is given a voice in two locals or not? I want to get that thoroughly clear, if that is the import of this resolution, to debar this fellow from having a voice in the musicians' local and also in the other local in which he has a card, though he is acting in the musicians' local. We have a union transfer system, so to speak, but that does not cover this phase of the subject. Now, is this professional card which Del. Parks spoke about going to give this individual an opportunity to go into the musicians' local and deliberate in the affairs of that musicians' local and at the same time take an active part in the other local in which he has this card, which he is a

member of? If it is he is in the position of sitting on two chairs, and I want to get that thoroughly understood as to this resolution. Now, if he is debarred from becoming a member of this musicians' local only in so far as his services are concerned, then I am clear and understand, but if he is going—

**THE CHAIRMAN:** The Chair will answer you by saying that in the opinion of the Chair this clause simply debars a man from paying dues in two organizations of the I. W. W. at the same time and thereby getting double representation in the convention.

**DEL. MAHONEY:** While I believe that the man should not be doubly represented in the organization, I am somewhat of the opinion that the amendment as it is worded might have a tendency to disfranchise a man who was a member of some department or industry of the Industrial Workers of the World in some localities from working as a musician at all. That is, if the musicians are going to hold meetings and have local autonomy in their internal affairs as musicians, you have made provision wherein if a man was a blacksmith and belonged to the International Association of Blacksmiths of the A. F. of L. he could hold membership in a musical union of the I. W. W., while if a man was a member of a mixed local of the I. W. W. he would be prohibited from that right. Then a question would arise, if the musicians' union had control of that industry in that locality, whether or not a member of the I. W. W. might not be disfranchised and disqualified from working as a musician in any way. This thing should be more specific.

**DEL. HALL:** Mr. Chairman, it occurs to me that the resolution as offered by the committee covers the whole case. The only people that could possibly be affected by this are those people who work at some trade and incidentally make a little money on the side playing in some band. Now, it occurs to me that if the professional musician is not attacked—and this resolution does not attack him—that it would not affect the other members who work at another trade and are capable of playing music. Now, we will take as an illustration the City of Chicago. We will say that there are enough musicians in the city of Chicago who carry on that trade professionally to organize a local of musicians. Such members would not belong to any trade union in the I. W. W. and they would not be affected in any way by this. Now, we will say that there is another man, another member of the organization who is working at the blacksmith trade and once in a while goes out and plays music for a fee. Now, if the proper spirit is manifested in our organization between the membership, there will be no objection on the part of the professional musician to this man playing on the side, and therefore it will not be necessary for him to have a card in the musicians' local. One of the principles established by the Manifesto and by the constitution of this organization is a universal transfer card system. Now, I claim that it means exactly what it says, "universal transfer card system." Now, if that is to be universal it is not to be limited in any sense, the transfer card. When a man is a member of the I. W. W. in any department and incidentally passes to another department, that is, to another calling, it does not affect his membership in the union, and the idea of the universal transfer card system means this, that a man who has a paid-up card in the I. W. W. must be accepted by any local and must be considered just as much a member of that local as though he held his membership there and voted on that proposition. The only difference is that he does not vote on matters within the local, that is, matters pertaining to the business of the local, but he is a member just the same and is given recognition by that local.

Now, we will say that there are no professional musicians entering into this proposition; we will say that there is nobody working in the trades that is affected or belonging to these locals. If that is true there is nothing to hinder them from being divided for musical purposes; that has no connection whatever with the union. That is, they don't pay the per capita tax in that union except as members of their trade union. Now, we have a condition that has grown up that is anomalous, and that is this: We have got a body of men who are already members of the I. W. W. that are claimed to form another department and pay per capita tax as members of a separate department from their trade union. At the same time they are members of another trade union, and it seems to me that the proposition was established simply for the purpose of graft. It seems to me that the proposition was established for the purpose of permitting certain officers to get a rake-off some place or to get salary that they could not get otherwise through any channel of the I. W. W.

DEL. MCINTOSH: I rise to a point of order. I object to Comrade Hall frequently using the term "trade union." It does not exist within the Industrial Workers of the World.

DEL. HALL: I am only using a term that is familiarly used, in order that I may define it. The committee has used the term "trade" and established the precedent, and it seems to me that I have a perfect right to use it to bring out that sense. Now, it seems to me there is no necessity for opposition to this resolution. It seems to me we can not serve any great purpose by permitting a man to belong to two unions in the I. W. W. And it seems to me it can serve a very harmful purpose by permitting that principle to creep into the organization. I do not believe the musicians will be served by it as individuals. Possibly a musicians' organization may be served by it, but I am speaking of individual musicians. It is not the organization that we are treating with as much as it is the individual, and it seems to me we ought to look at it from that standpoint. If there is any possibility of serving the interest of any individual member of the organization by voting that resolution down, I am in favor of doing it, but all the arguments that have been presented on the proposition seem to be regarding the interest of preserving the organization. Now, we do not want to preserve any organization; we do not want to build any organization; we simply want to establish the proposition that will provide for the interest of the individual members, and the individual member cannot possibly be served by giving him an opportunity to belong to two locals, because his interest as an individual man is harmed. Therefore we should not allow this principle to enter into the constitution.

DEL. ROGERS: Mr. President, and brother delegates, it seems to me the paramount question is to do away with this double representation. The question arises, how to do away with it? It seems to me this resolution absolutely does away with it. Then in regard to the other proposition, in regard to the cards; one would be a card that carries with it a vote; the other could be a working card; in view of the fact that it is the industry in which a man makes his living, it is the one he is most interested in. This musician proposition is simply an incident, and if this working card disqualifies him in his musical organization that card is an evidence itself that his interest is not as great as a musician as it is in the industry in which he makes his living, and that being a fact, the working card which disfranchises him virtually in that particular trade or industry would not work any harm.

DEL. SCHWEINBURG: I am opposed to the proposition of the Committee on Constitution because it would start a fight in our own rank and file. We have an organization belonging to the Industrial



Workers known as Local 83, Bartenders and Waiters. Some of those men are working in the trade that they have learned, but they are making so little money that they can not support their families and are forced to go out in the evening and tend bar or act as waiters in any locality. If you take away the right of those men to belong to that trades local union and at the same time belong to the Bartenders and Waiters as a local union in the I. W. W., Bartenders and Waiters, they have got to go out of business then. At the same time I will remind you that we have got the same people in the local of the I. W. W. There are men that belonged to the A. F. of L. at one time; I mean in the Bartenders and Waiters. We have got some that are musicians. The musicians went out of the A. F. of L. only because they were prohibited from belonging to the musicians and some other trade at the same time. Why should we discriminate against men like that and prevent them from going out and earning a living because their own trade don't give enough income to support their families?

DEL. BROWN: I see that Brother Schweinburg don't understand the situation at all. I am a member of Local 77, Goldfield, Nevada. We take in everybody outside of a carpenter, painter and decorator, members of the typographical union and electrical workers. We have men of all classes and trades in our mixed local. They can work at any business that they see fit and they can work as many shifts a day as they want to. Why can't these people come into the mixed local here and be members of the mixed local and work at anything they choose and not particular trades.

ALT. KIEFE: It is true that a majority of the members of Local 83 make a living in the line of bartenders and waiters and have to work doing other kinds of work during the week, but it is also true that the same fellows who are doing our work are taking away our bread and butter Saturdays and Sundays. We have one man who is a manufacturer of cigars and puts on the A. F. of L. label. Now, I don't like to see the Industrial Workers of the World in this convention vote for any kind of a scheme like that which we have got at the present time in our organization. I want to break it up.

DEL. FITZGERALD: I think we are a little muddled up on this thing. Del. Schweinburg don't seem to understand this as the committee has brought it in. I am in favor of the report or amendment brought in by the committee because that committee is living up to the clauses in the Manifesto. I have studied the Manifesto, and if I quote it right is this: That a member of the Industrial Workers of the World in one industry is a member in all industries. Now, that being the fact, we will say that at these tables here this man here is a fireman, that there is a machinist, the other a boiler-maker, the other a switchman and the other an engineer. We are all musicians, but we are all working for this Department of Transportation. We wish to organize a musical band. Now, then, we have got our cards in the musical department, and the only thing we need to do when we go out in this band is to have these cards in our pockets to show that we belong to one of the departments of the I. W. W., and therefore must be recognized in all other departments as members of the I. W. W. Therefore, I concur in the report of this committee.

(Question called for.)

THE CHAIRMAN: The question has been called for. If there are no objections on the part of any delegates present unanimous consent will be given to the adoption of this report of the committee.

DEL. McMULLEN: I wish to be recorded no.

DEL. PETRIELLA: I wish to be recorded no.

The roll was then called and resulted: Total vote 574; Yes, 326; No, 248.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is carried. The secretary will proceed.

#### ACTUAL WAGE-WORKER MEMBERS.

DEL. KINNEALLY: Article VII, Section 3; we recommend that it be stricken out and that in its place be inserted: "None but actual wage workers shall be members of the I. W. W."

It was moved and seconded to adopt the recommendation.

THE CHAIRMAN: If there is no objection this will be unanimously adopted.

ALT. KIEFE: Before you do that I would like to get information as to what a wage worker is.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair will state that if you do not know what a wage worker is I am of the opinion that it is impossible to inform you. Are there any objections to the adoption of this clause?

A DELEGATE: None.

DEL. McMULLEN: Is that an amendment to Article VII?

THE CHAIRMAN: It is an amendment to Section 3, Article VII.

DEL. McMULLEN: This amends it so that they cannot be a member of any organization?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

DEL. McMULLEN: The way this reads is "members at large."

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

DEL. McMULLEN: It disqualifies them so that we would have to take a man in that draws a salary, and at the same time he is an employer on the other side, by the adoption of this. Is that it? As the brother stated the proposition it cannot be denied that that is the situation. You propose to force into our ranks men who are employers a part of the time and wage earners in some other capacity.

THE CHAIRMAN: If any such case comes up, the minute that a wage worker becomes an employer he ceases to be a member of the union.

DEL. McMULLEN: He is a wage earner all the time. I desire to be recorded no. I don't care how it goes.

DEL. SIMS: Doesn't it state very clearly "none but actual wage earners?"

DEL. KINNEALLY: Yes, none.

DEL. McMULLEN: But these men are actual wage earners and actual employers.

DEL. DUNCAN: I move an amendment that we insert in addition to the matter there, "and no employer of labor shall be a member of the Industrial Workers of the world." Seconded.

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been regularly moved and seconded as an amendment that no employer of labor be admitted to membership in the I. W. W. Is that it?

DEL. SHENKAN: I suggest that this comrade add to his amendment also "self employer," as well as "employer."

DELEGATES: No.

DEL. PARKS: I will move an amendment to the amendment to cover the case of a foreman who has power to employ or discharge for his master. I believe that is not covered by Brother Duncan's motion. If it is I will withdraw the amendment.

DEL. DUNCAN: I will accept that in my amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair would like to divide it.

MR. PINKERTON: I will object to that amendment because it will shut out a most important part of our members. I would object

to that amendment with the addition of Brother Parks on the ground that as applied to the railway service it would shut out and proscribe a class that are almost entirely union men, such as foremen, etc. If this is adopted such men could not be members of this organization. I would be one of the first that would be shut out.

DEL. DUNCAN: I do not think the brother ought to object to being shut out. He must recognize that the class that he belongs to, the class of foremen, are dangerous to our organization. They are the class that are the tools of the corporations. They are the class that could to the best advantage perform the service of spies within this organization and militate to its ultimate disruption, and if he is a loyal member of the working class and a loyal adherent to the principles of industrial unionism and at the same time a foreman, he will cheerfully step out of this organization.

DEL. PINKERTON: Mr. Chairman, the application of the word "foreman" as applied by Brother Parks in this organization would paralyze the Industrial Workers of the World in the transportation service. If we would get no protection from this organization, those of us that are classified as foremen of engines, etc., that have a right to refuse to work with men and discharge if we felt so disposed, could operate this entire transportation or railway system with any scabs that we would put upon the footboard with us. Now, we are not spies in the interest of these corporations, taken either individually or collectively. As switchmen we have been the hardest fighters in the United States for our rights against the railway corporations, and I object to the word "foreman" being placed in the amendment.

DEL. HESLEWOOD: I object to placing this word "foreman" in there. Some of the finest members of the Western Federation of Miners have been foremen, shift bosses and superintendents of mines, and we want to get such men in the Industrial Workers of the World. We want to get agitators to hold the jobs of superintendents and foremen around the mines, to give our men the preference and keep our men in work. I will have to call my friend down on that. If these men are barred from belonging to their locals, before they will quit their organization they will refuse to take these jobs as foremen. This would put spotters and spies and scabs in as bosses over our men in the mine, and I will vote against any such thing.

DEL. TULLAR: For the benefit of the delegates who do not understand railroading—and I don't know a whole lot about it myself, but I know a little about it—I want to say that the contention of Brother Pinkerton is well founded, and the point that he is trying to get at is that when a certain switchman is appointed foreman over an engine, the engineer and fireman and perhaps two other switchmen are under him. He is but a switchman himself, but he has received orders to switch this car in here and take this car out of here and another car out of there, and so he is called a foreman, but he is actually nothing but an ordinary switchman; and he says that if that foreman is not allowed to be in this organization then they will appoint in his place a man whose interest is opposed to us, and I hold and contend that the foreman of an establishment employing eight, ten, fifteen or twenty thousand men is not in this same category as the foreman of a switching crew.

DEL. FITZGERALD: I believe that if Del. Parks understood the transportation service he would not have made this amendment to the amendment, or this man over here would not have said this man should step down and out because he is called a foreman. Now, as a railroad man and a man that knows but that industry, I want to say this:

That all those men that are in the railroad industries that are foremen, whether they be in the shop or in charge of bridge building or in the switching service in charge of those crews, if they are not salaried men or officials those men are nothing more than wage slaves. Such a man is put there and it means that he is to work through the day with men that shall perform the work; and we find this, that when a foreman finds a green man in the switching service who gives a back-up signal when the switchman told him to go ahead, where some man would be crushed to death, this foreman comes and says, "you will have to go back on the farm; this is no place for you in this yard." We know those foremen; those foremen are classified and put in there for their qualifications as railroad men, with authority to discharge the men, but they don't hire the men; the company sees to that. The company sees that the man is physically able to perform his duties, but the foreman can fire him and discriminate against him, and the only way that we have got to weed out the black-legs today in the transportation service is to have foremen there who if a man is not up to standard, will make him hit the high places, and if these men understood that, they would not be making any amendment to the amendment. And therefore I say that I object to seeing any man who is practically in favor of The Employers' Association.

DEL. SHENKAN: I would like to make an amendment to the amendment if there is no amendment to the amendment before the house.

THE CHAIRMAN: There is an amendment to the amendment.

DEL. DUNCAN: A point of personal privilege. If any one claims that I am an agent of the Employers' Association I want written charges against me, that is all.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair did not understand that you were charged with being an agent.

DEL. SHENKAN: I want here to go on record as being opposed to any self employer or employer of labor becoming a member or being a member at any time of the Industrial Workers of the World, and I will give you my reasons, which are from my own experience. In the city of San Francisco there are several men who had been formerly members of the Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance, that tried to become members of the mixed local in that city. Objections were raised against their eligibility, and there was correspondence on this question back and forth between a mixed local similarly situated in Oakland and the General Secretary-Treasurer. The General Secretary-Treasurer held that self employers of labor were eligible for membership in the I. W. W., and he stated in this letter that he would be willing to defend that position on the floor of this convention. But I merely want to describe the evils that were brought about by this. Practically the consequences were that two locals pretty nearly went out of existence. I contend, Mr. Chairman, that a self employer of labor has no business in the I. W. W., for this reason, that he is not immediately engaged in any struggle with the employing class for better conditions, for shorter hours, for better pay; he is not immediately engaged in the class struggle of the working class to the extent that the wage worker is engaged in it. He has a little shop of his own and he sells the products which he produces in it. Hence while he is a member of that particular local he looks for the patronage of the membership in that local, and all his efforts and all his energy in that particular locality are centralized upon this one particular point, to get the trade of the membership. If any action is intended by that local which might injure his business he votes against it. For instance, you take the little shoe-

maker that owns a little 2x4 shop; he does not employ anybody, it is true, but at the same time he looks for the trade of the individual members, to repair their shoes. If they go out on strike, their purchasing power being cut off, he cannot make a living, and hence he is going to vote against a strike. Various other occasions might be cited in the same way. I would like to hear the Secretary-Treasurer, since he makes that contention, sustain his point.

DEL. COX: Mr. Chairman and Delegates, I have had some experience along these lines, and I stand opposed to any and all amendments to the recommendation of the committee. I claim that the recommendation of the committee in the report is right, and that the recommendation of the committee adopted this morning giving complete local autonomy will cover the situation. We have had some trouble in St. Louis over this very proposition. I came instructed from my local to work for the adoption of this recommendation of the committee, for this one reason: We have had a barnacle or a carbuncle on the neck of the organization in St. Louis in the shape of a union almost completely composed of self-employers, and these self employers have appointed and paid a dues-collecting agent to go around to collect dues from each of these members. I refer to the mixed shoe workers' local in St. Louis. They have had all kinds of trouble on the proposition of the label. The General Secretary-Treasurer will bear me out in this and can give more light even than I can, because of the circulation of circulars throughout this country, and I want to say that this local is based upon and holds its position and existence upon the label, and therefore the local from which I come and which I represent is opposed positively to this thing and instructs me to work for its abolition, and that is the reason that I claim that nothing but wage workers shall belong to the I. W. W.

DEL. RYAN: Mr. Chairman, I find when it comes to voting on several proposed amendments to the constitution I can hardly do so intelligently at times. Now, this is a question where I am asked to decide what men shall do and what rules they shall be governed by in the industry with which I am familiar. At the same time others are attempting through an amendment of this proposed report of the Constitution Committee to regulate all interests. I would like to say that in the mining industry there are large places in the west where the ore deposits are of such a nature that the companies cannot go along continuously and operate producing mines. There are faults in the ground. I do not want to go into technical terms—but you can understand—except to say that the method of production in a good many districts is carried on by what is called leasers. A leaser is a regular miner who goes to work and operates a mine on a piece of ground and gets 30, 40 or 60 per cent of the product, whatever it may be. The majority of them are union men. The men that get the best pay at Cripple Creek are leasers. I have myself had to take leases and I have had to hire men to work them. In other words, I was exploiting their labor, and there can be no question in the world about it. Now, the way we have got around that is this: The question has been up in every convention of the Western Federation of Miners, for the last four or five years, and after full discussion the conclusion we arrived at was this, that we would leave it to the judgment of the local unions, each one to regulate their own affairs. Now, in the Globe Union the way they regulate it is this: Any member of our union who becomes a leaser and employs a little gang, or any member of the union who is appointed shift boss or foreman for the mining company, it cut off from so-called union benefits. He has got to come and take a withdrawal card out of the local, because the minute he goes in this business his interest is

with the employing class and not with the wage-working class. It may be that at other times he is one of the working class; it may be that his interest as an employer is slight, but so far as he has got some connection and has any identity of interest with the capitalist class, we claim that his connection with this organization shall cease. I for one shall vote for nothing but the original motion to concur in the report of the committee. Whenever we have got so hard up that we have to take shop bosses with us to conduct the affairs of the working class we better dissolve the working class organization immediately.

DEL. PARKS: I moved the amendment and I want to have the right of speaking to the amendment in closing.

DEL. AUGUSTINE: I am opposed to the amendment for the only reason that there is, that they are not wage workers. A self employer is not a wage worker. He is simply what is left over from the handicraft stage of production. Sometimes he is compelled to go into business for himself, but in those cases he is a cockroach boss, as we call him in the cities. He is not a wage worker. He produces for his own benefit and he has no interests in common with the wage worker. Now, I am opposed to the amendment that keeps out foremen, so to speak. This term "foreman" is used differently in different industries. In the building industry a foreman has not the authority to hire or discharge the men. A foreman is a man who is given the plans for the construction of a building or the doing of any work on a building. He is a wage worker. He receives no more compensation than the actual journeyman does and he has no power. There are cases, though, where a foreman usurps the power of the employer and tells the workmen that they are not good workmen, or that they are undesirable men, or something like that. There are cases when this occurs, but generally you find that the foreman is one of the men, and the unions that I have heretofore belonged to in the A. F. of L. have always taken care of their foremen if they have worked against the interests of the rank and file journeymen, those who were under them on the work. I know of cases where foremen have been fined \$300 for doing certain work against the interests of the men, and for that reason I think the unions themselves can take care of any such cases as may come before them. I am in favor of the original report because it keeps out all those who are not actual wage workers. The other things we can take care of afterwards.

DEL. PETRIELLA: Mr. Chairman, and Brothers, I have had personal experience with what we are talking about, and about that I want to say a few words. The wording does not amount to anything. Words are good for lawyers, but we must look at the substance of things. I hold that a man, no matter how you may call him, foreman or superintendent—a man who has the power of hiring and discharging employees is a man that the master trusts, and so far as the master trusts him we cannot trust him. In the place where I work I have been watching some of the unions, and I have noticed this, that when a man is selected as president or officer of a union there is distrust right away because they at once give him a job as foreman; they place him in an executive capacity, but only because he is an officer of the union, and if the men don't know, the master does know that that man is going to further his interest, the interest of the master and not the interest of the workers. I don't say that he is a spy, but that is his position. I have seen too much. I don't believe the people who say they would give their lives for the cause. When a man gets a good position he wants to stick to that position, and if he does not betray in the line of a spy and if he does not sell out the men who work under

him, he insults them and compels them to work more than they should, and he does whatever is in his power to keep his job and advance the interest of the master, and the interests of the master are opposed to the interest of the members of the union.

DEL. SIMS: I have had a little experience along this line of foremanship, and since I have been organizing for the Industrial Workers of the World I have had some experience along this cockroach proposition. Now, I want to say that if in the Industrial Workers of the World I must name one industry that I believe possesses the largest characteristics of the cockroach proposition, larger than any other industry, it is the cigar industry. We find in the Industrial Workers of the World a number whose principles go no further than to have the blue label; that they come into the Industrial Workers of the World to get the label and change from the blue to the red, but they have no reason further than that. They get into this organization, and join a local, but they are cockroaches nevertheless, and they use their energy at every point to enhance their material interests irrespective of the principles embodied in this organization. And I want to say also that any man who is a member of the Industrial Workers of the World and has a cockroach phase attached to his personality is a negation to our principles in every sense of the word. We claim in the very first part of the Preamble that we have nothing in common with the employer. Now, these cockroaches are all employers after they get strong enough to employ somebody, and as soon as they feel their oats and go to employing somebody they get the label so as to help them skin the other fellows.

THE CHAIRMAN: We are not talking about the label.

DEL. SIMS: No, but I am talking about the difference between wage slaves and cockroaches, and I hold that the interest of the working man as a foreman, irrespective of the argument that was brought up by Del. Fitzgerald and other delegates—I hold that a man's action is controlled by his material condition, and a man who is placed in an exalted position becomes inflated with the idea that he is just a little bit better than that other slave. It is inherent. It is one of the inherent traits of human nature. I know the fellow may be ever so fair; the fellow may be ever so good; he may carry ever so many Industrial Worker cards in his pocket and ever so many stamps attached to it; he may get up on the floor and make ever so many protestations of innocence—

DEL. FITZGERALD: I want to take exception to Brother Sims' statement in regard to "Brother Fitzgerald." I want to go on record in this convention as not being in favor of what you claim a foreman is. A foreman has very little power. A railroad foreman is not a man that employs. I want to go on record as not being in favor of capitalism.

DEL. SIMS: Who has the floor?

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Fitzgerald, Del. Sims has the floor, and I believe your position is clear to the delegates.

DEL. SIMS: I want to show you here. I have got a card in my hand, and it is the card of Herman Reed, manufacturer of I. W. W. cigars. That is a cockroach proposition.

THE CHAIRMAN: Del. Sims—

DEL. SIMS: I am showing you the difference between wage slave and an employer. I am bringing a concrete proposition to you, and I think I ought to have an opportunity to show it. I don't want to detain you. I want to avoid that, if possible, but I want to show the principle. Now, I am speaking of a man that belongs to the Industrial Workers of the World. He put out an advertisement here. He is handing

these cards to wage slaves and he says, "Come in and buy my cigars because I am an I. W. W. man." You are exploiting the wage slaves for the benefit of that cockroach, and that fellow's interests are diametrically opposed to your interests. I hold that a foreman, irrespective of his protestations of innocence, irrespective of his saying "I am with you," is opposed to you in every way, shape and form. Though he passes himself off as a friend, he belongs to the employing class, and that brother's interest is going to be the employing class' interest. His job depends on it. Now, one second about you people who work on the railroad. I know something about the railroad proposition and the foreman proposition. He can't hire, but it is a cinch he can fire. Now when he has got this proposition his job is at stake. You get a wage slave from the rank and file who is working over many; he may be a section hand, or he may be a painter or working along with switchmen or something of that kind; whenever one of those section hands there gets a little bit upish and he begins to talk to his fellow wage slaves and begins to point out to them the class struggle, this foreman is going to get a letter quick, a letter reading so and so; and so in order to hold his job and enhance his material interest he is going to call that wage slave down, notwithstanding his protestations of innocence.

DEL. MOORE: I think a good deal of the misunderstanding results because you have not heard the amendment to the amendment that Duncan read. I think it covers that point, with the possible exception of Comrade Pinkerton and Fitzgerald, and for the benefit of Comrade Sims I would like to read it again. The amendment to the amendment, as Comrade Duncan put it, reads: "Amended, that no employer of labor and no foreman who has authority to employ or discharge can be a member of the I. W. W. in a department or union." Now, I think that covers Comrade Ryan's contention that the man in the local or in the industry, when he becomes an employer, ceases to be a member of the union, and is perfectly willing for the time being that he is a self-employer or employing some one else, to step down and out of the ranks until he goes back to work as a wage slave. I think this covers this comrade's contention from New York.

DEL. RYAN: Will you allow me to say a few words? As I realize from the discussion that has taken place on this floor that there is a vast difference between a leaser in the mining industry that I have mentioned and a foreman that Del. Pinkerton mentions, I would not want to have the two confused together at all. I would consider a leaser an exploiter for the time being, but from the statement of what the foreman's duties were he is more a fellow-worker with the fellow in the yard than an exploiter.

DEL. MOORE: It says, "Amended, that no employer and no foreman who has authority to hire and discharge," and also "no self-employer." That is the amendment to the amendment, and I think we can all vote for it.

DEL. McMULLEN: Will Del. Moore give way to a question?

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you desire to give way to a question?

DEL. MOORE: Not now. Wait till I get through.

THE CHAIRMAN: Not now, Del. McMullen.

DEL. MOORE: This amendment of the comrade from New York—that is the amendment to the amendment—that no self-employer can be a member is proper. I corroborate what Comrade Duncan said. There was a member of the I. W. W., a carpenter in Indianapolis, in a mixed local, that was perfectly willing and brought it up before the union, that he should get down and out on some proposition where he felt it to his material interest to vote against a strike because he would decrease the money that he was earning. I believe that no employer



or no self-employer is going to be in this organization, and it should be stated so, and let the cockroaches get on one side of the fence or the other.

DEL. McMULLEN: I would like to ask the brother a question now. What I want to ask is this: The amendment that you read of Bro. Duncan, if it had in there "shall cease active membership, shall not be an active member," that covers the conditions relative to employers; I have that impression.

DEL. MOORE: I don't think that word "active" is in there.

DEL. McMULLEN: The word "active" is not in there?

DEL. MOORE: No.

DEL. McMULLEN: "Should not be an active member." In other words, he should simply become an honorary member, as they put it.

DEL. MOORE: "Should not be a member."

DEL. McMULLEN: This should have in it the word "active." That "active" would mean while he is in that capacity as a foreman. That is the way it should be, so that as to Bro. Ryan, he should cease his active membership.

DEL. PINKERTON: A point of information. I believe we are oversteeping the bounds of this constitution that has already been passed upon when we state that each industry shall have the right to handle its own internal affairs without dictation from anybody else; in the same line that our state laws are supreme as to all internal affairs.

DEL. PARKS: I rise to a point of order. I think the author of the amendment should share in some of this debate. I was the originator of that, and I have a good deal to say, and I think I ought to have the floor to show the reasons.

THE CHAIRMAN: You will get a chance.

DEL. KOHL: I object to the word "foreman," and the reason why is this. As a railroad man I work in the transportation industry in this way: We work under a foreman all the way through. We have got where I work about 85 foremen handling 200 or 300 men, with two men under the foreman. He merely instructs us which way or what way to go. We have also got foremen on the section, and I would say this, if you put that "foreman" in there then the corporation will hire foremen who will run the balance of us and so control and rule and ruin the union.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair is of the opinion that the vote can be taken now and the result arrived at and all debating to the contrary will not change a vote.

DEL. DUNCAN: As I offered the amendment I claim the right to close the debate.

THE CHAIRMAN: Close the debate.

DEL. GOLDBERG: I want to make a few remarks on the question to clear up the situation, I think.

THE CHAIRMAN: You will have the floor then, and we will see if you can clarify it.

DEL. GOLDBERG: I think there is another question about foremen here in connection with giving local autonomy. There are two propositions. Take, for instance, the textile industry. They have got foremen, but they are directly acting in the interest of the employer and in opposition to the working class. On the other hand, in the transportation industry we find that according to the system of their work the foreman is part and parcel of the rank and file, part of our class, and we should not adopt any rule in a general way that would conflict either with the textile or other industries or the transportation indus-

try. Therefore I suggest that those should be given their local autonomy.

DEL. DUNCAN: As regards this proposition of local autonomy, I want to say that it is a dangerous thing. Now, there are two or three brothers who got up here and contended that the affair of qualification for membership should be left to the local unions. Nothing can be more dangerous to this organization, if we are going to have a unified working class organization and nothing else. I want to cite an instance on this point. You can look to Grand Junction, Colorado, for an example. You can find, so I have been told, a local union of the I. W. W. in which there is not a single bona fide wage worker. They are real estate men, lawyers, doctors, business men, and they have a charter of the I. W. W. Leave it to their local districts? Just one instance of local districts in this matter will hold the entire I. W. W. up to public ridicule that it will never recover from. The A. F. of L. in Grand Junction and in all the country around Denver are laughing at that form of unionism that permits such a thing. Now, I want to ask any one of you brothers who have raised objections to this restriction of our membership on the ground that it will work a hardship in the case of some individual who is forced to act as foreman, if the advantage to be gained by retaining even a president, being a foreman in those positions, can in any way compensate for the ridicule that can be hurled at the I. W. W. for our chartering a local composed entirely of business men. As regards this proposition of disposing of our foreman members, I do not see any reason for handling them roughly. I quite agree with Bro. McMullen's suggestion that we give them withdrawal cards and let them remain honorary members, but I think the word that he suggested—

A DELEGATE: "Active members."

DEL. DUNCAN: "Active members"—I think the word "active" is a little ambiguous there. You might call me an inactive member of this convention because I have not had very much to say, but I want to cover his point and cover it satisfactorily. I will accept in that amendment the provision that foreman shall not be members except as honorary members—with that insertion, except as "honorary members." I think that ought to be satisfactory to anybody that wants to stand on the slave side of the class struggle.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: I just want to ask one question of the brother. Who gave you the information that the local at Grand Junction was composed of business men?

DEL. DUNCAN: I said I had been told. I have not been there. I qualified my assertions in regard to that.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: That is news to me altogether. I never heard it, nor does the charter in any way imply that business men belong to that local.

DEL. DUNCAN: For the Secretary-Treasurer's benefit I will state the source of my information. It came from a former resident of Grand Junction who was a member of the local there and is at present recording secretary of Local 178, I. W. W., Seattle.

DEL. MARKLEY: A question of information. I would like to ask if there is any delegate in the convention that can throw any further light on this question.

(Question called for.)

DEL. MARKLEY: Call the roll.

ALT. KIEFE: We are voting on the amendment to the amendment, aren't we?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

DEL. KINNEALLY: Let me state the question so as to save time. I would claim that this amendment to the amendment included the amendment of Brother Parks.

DEL. PARKS: A question of withdrawing. I wish to withdraw the amendment to the amendment that I made.

DEL. KINNEALLY: Then we are voting on one amendment, and then comes the original clause.

DEL. FOX: Read it.

DEL. KINNEALLY: "Amended, that no employer of labor and no foreman who has authority to employ or discharge can be a member of the I. W. W., and that no self employer can be a member of an I. W. W. department or union."

DEL. DUNCAN: Please insert the words, as per the suggestion of McMullen, "except as honorary members."

DEL. PINKERTON: They object to that.

THE CHAIRMAN: The amendment is before the house. Are there any further objections? Call the roll.

DEL. KLEESE: A point of information.

THE CHAIRMAN: What is your point of information?

DEL. KLEESE: I want to know how to vote. I want to sustain the original motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: Then vote against the amendment. You ought not have to ask that question.

DEL. FOX: I would be in favor of excluding employers and self employers, but I think the foreman proposition should come out of it.

DEL. RICHTER: Then vote it down.

The roll was called and the vote resulted: Total vote, 559; Yes, 239; No, 320.

THE CHAIRMAN: The amendment is lost. The Secretary will call the roll.

A DELEGATE: What is the question?

DEL. KINNEALLY: That Section 3, Article VII, be stricken out and in its place insert "None but actual wage workers shall be members of the I. W. W."

A DELEGATE: Unanimous consent.

THE CHAIRMAN: If there is no objection on the part of any delegate unanimous consent will be given to the adoption of this report of the committee.

DEL. McMULLEN: I desire to be recorded in the negative.

DEL. DUNCAN: I object.

THE CHAIRMAN: Call the roll.

The roll was then called.

DEL. REID: I wish to change my vote to "not voting." I voted no, against it, which might imply that I voted against the proposition, but I do not vote because it is not clear.

DEL. DUNCAN: I wish to explain my not voting. It is not because I am opposed excluding anybody who is not a bona fide wage worker from the I. W. W., but because the word used there is a doubtful word and we do not know what it means, and until you do define what you mean by "bona fide wage workers" this section of our constitution is meaningless hodgepodge.

DEL. MOORE: I want to go on record as not voting, on the same idea.

ALT. KIEFE: That applies to me for the same reason.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Secretary informs me that there are two or three telegrams on the desk which he desires to have read before we

adjourn. If you will wait till the vote is announced we will have the telegrams read and then adjourn.

The vote was announced as follows: Total vote, 553; Yes, 442; No, 111.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is carried.

#### TELEGRAMS.

The Secretary read the following telegrams:

"Seattle, Sept. 28.—W. E. Trautmann: Seattle Industrial unionists send greetings to revolutionists. No compromise. L. Herman, Local 178." (Applause.)

"Toronto, Ont., Sept. 27.—James Reid, per W. E. Trautmann, I. W. W. Convention—Dear Comrades: I. W. W. Locals of Toronto send congratulations on the stand taken by the revolutionary element against reactionists."

"Butte, Mont.—William E. Trautmann: I will be responsible for the five hundred. See Sherman's dispatch. M. P. Haggerty." (Applause.)

The convention then adjourned until 2 o'clock P. M.

#### AFTERNOON SESSION—SEPT. 29.

Chairman St. John called the convention to order at two o'clock.

THE CHAIRMAN: The secretary informs me that he has some resolutions on the desk which he will now read.

#### HAGGERTY TELEGRAM EXPLAINED.

DEL. FITZGERALD: Just before the resolutions are read, if the Chair would allow, I would like to have Comrade Edwards or Trautmann explain to this convention the telegram that was sent by Haggerty of Montana.

THE CHAIRMAN: Comrade Edwards will explain it.

SEC. EDWARDS: You will have to lay that over till Comrade Trautmann is present.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair can probably explain it, then. I will state that ex-President Sherman yesterday wired to Butte Milling and Smeltermen's Union about his being deposed here and told them to take steps to collect the \$500 which this organization owes to Butte Milling and Smeltermen's Union, such amount being left of the amount advanced by the Butte Milling and Smeltermen's Union out of the sum of \$1,000; that Sherman wired them to immediately take steps to collect the \$500 due them. Haggerty's telegram is to the effect that he stands good for the \$500. (Applause.)

DEL. FRENCH: I understand from remarks that I have heard that ex-President Sherman has taken similar action with regard to other moneys owed by the I. W. W. Is there any information as to that? I think if the man has gone to such an extreme as to do such things it should be known and recorded.

DEL. HALL: In line with that I would like to ask for information here if Sherman is still in charge of the headquarters office.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is something I don't know anything about.

DEL. HALL: If he is shouldn't some steps be taken so that he can not do any other harmful things? It is in his power now, if he is in charge of the office, to do some very harmful things to the organization. It seems to me that if the convention is powerful enough to depose him from office it is powerful enough to take the office away from him, and it seems to me some steps should be taken for this purpose.

THE CHAIRMAN: I have no knowledge that Sherman is anywhere around the office or has been since. The secretary will probably be able to tell us when he comes. Proceed with the reading of the resolutions.

## RESOLUTIONS.

The following additional resolutions were read and referred:

## NO. A.

From Local 222, Spokane, Wash. (Missing.)  
(Referred to Committee on Constitution.)

## NO. B.

Presented by Metal and Machinery Department Local No. 7, Chicago, Albert Schulz, delegate.

Resolution No. 1. All organizing work shall be conducted through the local or district council wherever possible.

No. 2. The referendum should be used on all matters pertaining to the good and welfare of the organization.

No. 3. The figure of 25 cents on the due stamp should be changed to 50 cents.

No. 4. The minutes of the meetings of the Executive Board should be sent to each local union after each meeting.

(Committee on Constitution.)

## NO. C.

Amendment to constitution to take the place of paragraph directly affected thereby, offered by Del. French:

"And shall be composed of wage workers brought together in an organization embodying thirteen departments, general industrial unions, local industrial unions, local recruiting unions, industrial councils and individual members. Individual members shall be those wage workers who, in isolated places, desire to attach themselves to the I. W. W. until such time as a body of this organization to which they are eligible shall be organized in their locality. Local recruiting unions shall be composed of wage workers in whose respective industries in a given locality there does not exist sufficient membership for a local industrial union. Local industrial unions shall be composed of wage workers in a given industry in a given locality welded together in craft or shop branches or as the particular requirements of said industry may render necessary. A General industrial union shall be composed of the local industrial unions in the various localities in a given industry. An industrial department shall be made up of general industrial unions of closely kindred industries appropriate for representation in the departmental administration and assigned thereto by the General Executive Board of the I. W. W. Industrial councils for the purpose of establishing general solidarity in a given district may be organized and shall be composed of delegates from not less than five local industrial or local recruiting unions, and shall maintain communication between such district and general headquarters. The departments shall be designated as follows."

(Referred to Committee on Constitution.)

## NO. D.

Whereas, Every working class organization should be thoroughly democratic; and

Whereas, The rank and file of the Industrial Workers of the World should have the means as well as the warrant to rule; therefore be it

Resolved, That a referendum vote of the entire membership of the I. W. W. be provided for on matters of most vital importance to the organization, such as the adoption of constitutions and amendments thereto, and the election of all general officers; and be it further

Resolved, That any local union, by its majority vote, seconded by the

majority votes of four other local unions, may at any time initiate a referendum vote in the I. W. W., either in the general organization or in the department most concerned.

C. H. DUNCAN,

Representing Spokane Local Union No. 222.

(Committee on Constitution.)

#### NO. E.

To the Second Annual Convention of the Industrial Workers of the World.

Fellow Delegates:

I hereby desire that the conditions prevailing in the Bartenders and Waiters' Union No. 83 be thoroughly investigated and such action be taken as the report of the committee will warrant. I hold that the said local is not properly organized in accordance with the principles underlying the I. W. W. for the following reasons:

1st. That the said local is a craft organization, whose members do not even follow the vocation their charter would designate. Most of their members work in other lines of industry, such as cigarmaking, shoemaking, painting and quite a number of diversified kinds of work during week days while on Sunday they work as bartenders and waiters at picnics, balls, etc., which tends to increase the hour of labor for the few who seek favors from their employers to the detriment of the many engaged in such work, thereby most effectually retarding the growth of the organization.

2nd. At the time said charter was granted some of their members were employers of labor—owing to a death benefit fund which said local maintains, said employers still retain membership in said local.

3rd. Some of its members are cigar manufacturers who retain the use of the cigarmakers' A. F. of L. label; as a consequence of which the discussion of Industrial Unionism is virtually prohibited since such discussion might injure the patronage of A. F. of L. cigars.

4th. The discussion of Industrial Unionism is barred to a great extent for the reason that its members seek employment from A. F. of L. unions when such unions hold any festivities, as a consequence it is feared that the reflex of said local of Bartenders and Waiters No. 83 would be too radical, too socialistic, etc., if any discussion on Industrial Unionism is tolerated.

I recommend that the said local of Bartenders and Waiters No. 83, as well as Local No. 263 of Hotel and Restaurant Employes be reorganized in order that there may be one charter governing all Hotel and Restaurant Employes in the city of Chicago and vicinity with such branches as local conditions will justify.

I. SHENKAN,

No. 173, San Francisco.

(Committee on Organization.)

#### NO. F.

Resolved, That no member shall be eligible to become a member of the G. E. B. or General Secretary-Treasurer or Assistant General Secretary-Treasurer of the I. W. W. who is a member of any fraternal society or other labor organization.

W. L. HALL.

(Committee on Constitution.)

DEL. DE LEON: I would suggest that this resolution be passed on immediately, so that that matter may be covered.

(No action.)

#### NO. G.

Whereas, Complete autonomous action on the part of any section of a labor organization is always prejudicial to the general welfare of such organization, be it

Resolved, That the expression "complete industrial autonomy," or "complete autonomy," or "complete departmental autonomy" shall not be used in the constitution of the I. W. W.

CARL DUNCAN,

Representing Spokane Local Union No. 222.

(Committee on Constitution.)

NO. H.

Whereas, A workingman who pays dues into a genuine labor organization has a right to know how his money is spent; therefore be it

Resolved, That no one shall draw a salary from the Industrial Workers of the World, except the same is provided for in our constitution and that the exact amount of every salary or wage paid to any officer or employee of the Industrial Workers of the World shall be named in our constitution.

Fraternally submitted by

CARL DUNCAN,

Representing Spokane Local Union No. 222.

(Committee on Constitution.)

#### LIMIT ON PRESENTING RESOLUTIONS.

DEL. RIORDAN: Mr. Chairman, if the motion would be in order now, while I do not wish to in any way deprive any delegate of the right to present resolutions regarding amendments to our constitution, I do, though, think that we should offer the following motion: That any delegate wishing to bring in any resolutions regarding the amendment of our constitution shall have them in here by noon tomorrow; that is, if we convene tomorrow; if not they shall be in here immediately on convening on Monday morning. I think that the drafting of resolutions will continue until we are ready to adjourn if we do not limit the time, and it will take up necessary time here. I believe that any delegate here who has any resolutions to offer between now and that time should bring them in. I would therefore make that as a motion. (Seconded.)

DEL. DUNCAN: I move as an amendment that we extend the time to Monday morning in any event.

DEL. RICHTER: A question of information. Is this question in regard to the constitution?

DEL. RIORDAN: It is in regard to amendments to the constitution, that is all.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there a second to the amendment? (Seconded.) It is regularly moved and seconded that no more resolutions pertaining to constitutional amendments be accepted after tomorrow noon in case we sit in session tomorrow, or Monday morning in case we do not. An amendment has been offered that the time be extended to Monday morning in any event. Are you ready for the amendment?

DEL. RIORDAN: I do not know whether anyone has seconded my motion or not.

A DELEGATE: I second it.

DEL. RIORDAN: But I would be quite willing if it is satisfactory to the delegates to let it go until Monday, rather than have a roll call on the amendment.

DEL. DUNCAN: You accept that amendment?

DEL. RIORDAN: I accept it.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have heard the motion that the time for bringing in resolutions pertaining to constitutional amendments be limited to Monday morning. If there is no objection—

DEL. McMULLEN: Any time before noon that day?

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair would so rule. If there is no objection

the Chair will order this carried unanimously. The Chair hears none and it is so ordered.

DEL. FRENCH: Is that settled?

THE CHAIRMAN: That is settled.

DEL. FRENCH: I would like also that it be understood that in the future when the meeting convenes the Chair will ask if there are any resolutions to be read. It will avoid putting a fellow in the position that I am, for instance, having that amendment three days unread. It appears now as though it was just presented. The fact is none of those things have been read since the batch were read. We have been waiting to put it before the house.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair will try to remember that.

#### EXPEDITING BUSINESS.

THE CHAIRMAN: Before the Constitution Committee goes on with its report I desire to say this much to the delegates, that since I have been in the Chair I have endeavored to expedite the business of this convention with the idea of making up as much lost time as I could regardless of parliamentary tactics, rules, fairness or anything else. Now, I am going to continue in that attitude, and I cannot make it effective unless I have the co-operation of the delegates here who desire to finish the work of this convention as speedily as possible, and if it is not the desire of the delegates I do not desire to stay here as chairman. Unless that co-operation is accorded the Chair in future I will exercise my right to resign as Chairman and you can select another one. (Applause.)

#### CONSTITUTION COMMITTEE—STENOGRAPHIC REPORTS.

The Committee on Constitution continued its report as follows:

DEL. KINNEALLY: We present to you—I will say it will come in the section or article governing conventions—a section which reads as follows: "That a true and complete stenographic report of all the proceedings of all general conventions be printed in bound form as soon after the convention adjourns as possible." We recommend the adoption of this paragraph or section.

It was moved and seconded that the amendment be adopted.

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been regularly moved and seconded that the resolution or amendment to the constitution just read by the Secretary of the Constitution Committee be adopted. You have heard the motion, are you ready for the question?

DEL. HALL: I would like to offer an amendment if it is not already provided for (I don't know that it is), that we include the meetings of the General Executive Board. They have a stenographer at headquarters that can take a stenographic report of the General Executive Board meetings. It seems to me this is as important and more important than a stenographic report of our convention. I would like to amend it by adding "and meetings of the General Executive Board," where it would make the proper sense.

DEL. SIMS: I second the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN: An amendment has been offered to include stenographic minutes or reports of the General Executive Board. You have heard this amendment, are you ready for the question? (Question called for.) The question has been called for. If there is nobody objecting unanimous consent will be given to the adoption of this resolution or amendment.

DEL. FITZGERALD: I would like to know if this amendment means that that is going to be put up in bound form, too?



DEL. KINNEALLY. A further recommendation: "Resolved that a local executive board without salary be elected by the General Executive Board, whose duty it will be to meet weekly and oftener if necessary to pass on all bills before payment and assist the officers in outlining organization work, etc., requiring immediate attention, such local board to be subordinate to the General Executive Board." We recommend adoption.

It was moved and seconded to adopt the resolution.

THE CHAIRMAN: If there is no delegate who wishes to be recorded as voting no on Bro. Hall's amendment the Chair will declare that it is carried unanimously.

DEL. McKINNON: I think you ought to call the roll. I ask that the roll be called on all motions.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair will rule your roll call out of order.

DEL. McKINNON: I appeal from the ruling of the Chair. I do not wish to speak against this section, but I want to be recorded either voting for or against. I appeal from the ruling of the Chair. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: You can be recorded as voting against it if you desire.

DEL. McMULLEN: Is this the matter of creating a local quorum?

THE CHAIRMAN: No, it is Bro. Hall's amendment. The Chair thought Secretary Kinneally had some further recommendation of the Constitution Committee that covered that.

DEL. McMULLEN: What is that amendment of Bro. Hall's?

THE CHAIRMAN: It is that meetings of the General Executive Board be taken down stenographically.

DEL. McMULLEN: I thought that was adopted.

THE CHAIRMAN: When the Secretary got up I thought he had a further recommendation of the Constitution Committee that covered that point which he was going to read for Delegate Hall's benefit, so that there would not need to be any amendment. The amendment of Delegate Hall is before the house.

DEL. SIMS: In view of the fact that I seconded the amendment I withdrew my second if you have got anything that covers it.

DEL. McKINNON: I appealed from the ruling of the Chair and my appeal has been seconded.

DEL. DE LEON: I move to lay that appeal on the table. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded that the appeal lie on the table. You have heard the motion. The secretary will call the roll.

DEL. MARKLEY: No objection.

DEL. FITZGERALD: I would like to call for a unanimous vote to lay on the table.

THE CHAIRMAN: You cannot get it.

The roll was called and resulted: Total vote, 440; yes, 325; no, 115.

THE CHAIRMAN: The appeal is laid on the table. The vote now occurs on the amendment of Bro. Hall.

DEL. VEAL: Mr. Chairman and brother delegates, recognizing that the Chair's objections have been put what we would consider to the bad here with this farce way of voting, and a vote is supposed to be taken as giving an expression of ayes and noes by men registering no, are we going to continue to carry on this convention and hold it two days longer, taking this farce of a roll call because a man gets up and demands to be recorded as voting no? Therefore, I would suggest to the Chair that whenever one man like this feels a desire to vote no let us settle it by taking his vote, and then we will know. This thing has gone far enough. They are only making a farce out of this thing.

THE CHAIRMAN: If there are no objections to Del. Hall's amendment it will be passed by unanimous consent. The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

DEL. McKINNON: I desire to be recorded as not voting.

THE CHAIRMAN: Del. McKinnon desires to be recorded as not voting. The vote now occurs on the recommendation of the committee as amended. If no one wishes to be recorded in the negative the Chair will declare that portion of the committee's report adopted as amended. The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

#### LOCAL EXECUTIVE BOARD.

DEL. KINNEALLY: The Committee on Constitution recommend that the following become a paragraph or section of the constitution: We recommend that a Local Executive Board without salary be elected by the General Executive Board, whose duty it will be to meet weekly and oftener if necessary to pass on all bills before payment and assist the officers in outlining the organization work, etc., requiring immediate attention, such local board to be subordinate to the General Executive Board.

DEL. HALL: I would just like to ask a question. That expression in there, "without salary," does that mean that no expenses or salary or emolument of any kind shall be given to those men for their weekly meeting; no expense money or anything of that kind?

DEL. KINNEALLY: It means no salary. Of course, if a man pays expense money out of his own pocket, certainly he has no right to take the money out of his own pocket, but salary, no.

DEL. AUGUSTINE: Is there a motion before the house?

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair does not know of any.

DEL. PETRIELLA: I move to concur. (Seconded.)

DEL. AUGUSTINE: I move to concur in the resolution.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is moved and seconded to concur. Are you ready for the question?

DEL. PETRIELLA: I would like to ask the Secretary of the Constitution Committee what he means by expenses. He said that no salary will be paid to this executive board. A man who lives in Chicago I suppose has no expenses to get to headquarters, so he is to get nothing at all. Is it understood that way?

DEL. KINNEALLY: Yes.

DEL. PETRIELLA: All right.

DEL. PINKERTON: I cannot agree to that motion as it is read there, for a great many reasons. The wording of it places the Executive Board in such a position that probably they might command some local representative to lose time. Now, without entering into any debate on this thing in regard to expense or anything else I would be in favor of this Local Executive Board being paid one's day's wages and their expenses for their time served in the interests of the organization.

DEL. AUGUSTINE: I am in favor of this clause and I do not believe any working man belonging to this organization would want a salary for doing voluntary work for this organization if he lives in this vicinity. That clause is not understood to say if an Executive Board member or the General Executive Board desires to have a man represent him on that board coming from out of town, that that man will not be receiving his expense money, or that he will be expected to pay that out of his pocket. That is not so, but for him to receive wages for voluntary work, I do not think he ought to demand it. This work can be done evenings and at night and can be done so as not to interfere with regular work. I know men in the organization all over the country that are doing work for the organization at all times and are not

getting paid for it. I believe if a man has the interests of his working class organization at heart he will not demand any wages.

DEL. TULLAR: Those are practically my views.

(Question called for.)

THE CHAIRMAN: The question has been called for. Is there any delegate who desires to be recorded voting in opposition to this?

DEL. HENDRICKS: I desire to be recorded no.

DEL. McMULLEN: I desire to be recorded no.

DEL. McKINNON: I won't vote.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any other delegate who desires to be recorded in the negative?

DEL. SCHOMBERG: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: Del Schomberg desires to be recorded voting in the negative. Any other delegate? If not, the Chair will declare the motion to concur carried. It is so ordered.

DEL. KINNEALLY: That is all at the present time.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any further committees to report?

#### COMMITTEE ON REPORTS OF OFFICERS.

DEL. SHENKAN: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask that the Committee on Reports of Officers be either increased or discharged because it seems quite difficult to get them all together and act upon the reports of officers, because there is quite a task before them. If they do not want to act the committee won't be able to report.

#### COMMITTEE ON STYLE.

DEL. KINNEALLY: I beg the indulgence of the convention for a few moments. Through my neglect I overlooked one article that we wish to insert. Del. De Leon has called my attention to it. It was my mistake. It is an article that we should insert in the constitution as to style: "All clauses or words in conflict with the amendments adopted by this convention are hereby annulled, and the General Executive Board is instructed to act as a Committee on Style in the preparation of the amended constitution."

DEL. FRENCH: I move its adoption. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been regularly moved and seconded that the clause just read by the Committee on Constitution be adopted.

DEL. DE LEON: I desire to have the matter stated in the stenographic record that we do not recommend that as a clause in the constitution, but we recommend it as a guide to the incoming G. E. B.

DEL. DUNCAN: I would like to hear that resolution again. Is that for the purpose of shutting off debate?

THE CHAIRMAN: The recommendation just read, do you mean?

DEL. DUNCAN: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: It provides that the General Executive Board shall constitute a Committee on Style; that is, that they should engross the constitution upon the adjournment of this convention and have it printed.

DEL. DUNCAN: Isn't the convention to have a voice in the matter?

DEL. DE LEON: No.

DEL. DUNCAN: I am opposed to that because I think this convention ought to see that constitution complete here before we go.

DEL. RYAN: Mr. Chairman, I would like to state that I am not in favor of that proposition as it stands here at this time. That is one of the duties of the incoming General Executive Board, whoever they may be, and I contend as one delegate on this floor who has paid attention to all the matters that have been submitted by the Committee

on Constitution that I for one would not be in a position to leave this convention hall at adjournment and go home and give my constituents a proper account of the work of this convention. So much has transpired here that a man is required to give a confused report. I contend that it is the duty of the delegates to this convention to see that an engrossing committee or a committee on style or whatever you choose to call it, be appointed to go to the Secretary and find any official records or any amendments which have been offered to the constitution, and that those shall be stricken off and put in the hands of every delegate before the convention adjourns. There is no reason in the world why it cannot be done.

DEL. DE LEON: This resolution does not conflict with that at all. That would be very desirable indeed, and if that motion should be made I shall certainly second it. All the changes that have been made and all additions are to be printed and furnished to the delegates so that they can go home and say what was done. Is that it?

DEL. RYAN: I would be perfectly satisfied if this resolution provided what you say, but it just says that the General Executive Board shall do it.

DEL. DE LEON: No, if the brother will allow me, this resolution goes no further than to state that the General Executive Board shall act as a committee on style. Now, we have no time to go over everything—that would have to be done—over the whole constitution. Clauses are eliminated; for instance the word "President" every time it occurs in the paragraphs that we have not otherwise touched. The President, for instance, is referred to in several places. In all such cases that word would have to be expunged. It has been inferentially expunged by the amendments that have been accepted. The word "nomination" has been removed in the first paragraph; inferentially it has been removed from all the others. Now, the committee on style has no duty other than to take the paragraphs that have not been passed upon and which remain in the constitution and eliminate from them such words or such passages as would be in conflict with the amendments that have been adopted. That is as far as the resolution proposes. What Bro. Ryan proposes is excellent, but that is beyond us; that belongs to the Committee on Resolutions. Let a resolution be introduced instructing the Secretary or the proper official to provide each delegate with an exact statement of the changes that have been made. Isn't that it—with the amendments that have been adopted and the clauses that have been removed, etc.? He does not mean that there shall be supplied to each delegate an exact copy of the whole constitution—a printed copy of the whole constitution. He simply wants to have a copy of the changes made; in other words, of the actions taken on the report of the Committee on Constitution, and that I am highly in favor of, but that desire does not conflict with this proposition.

DEL. RYAN: I would like to say, if it would be proper at this time, that the reason I am not satisfied with it at this time is because it is not sufficiently specific, for my understanding of the work of the convention is simply this: We are considering and adopting amendments to the constitution, and owing to the ruling made the other day all amendments that we adopt become immediately the law, right there and then. We further understood each other to this effect, that after we are through considering all the amendments to the constitution and by-laws, then a motion will be passed that we adopt the constitution as a whole as amended by this body. Then as soon thereafter as possible I for one want to be in possession of an official record of all the amendments that we have adopted here. I did not ask, as you said, that we have an entire transcript of the amended constitution, because I claim that every delegate on the floor as well as myself has sufficient knowl-

edge to be able to state what has been changed and what has not, and that we can explain to our constituents then what the changes are, but otherwise I would not be satisfied because this thing is not specific enough.

DEL. DE LEON: I would request that the recommendation of Del. Ryan be embodied in our recommendation. It is an additional recommendation, since it is not part of the constitution, that each delegate be furnished with a copy. Will you agree to that?

DEL. RYAN: Yes.

DEL. DE LEON: That each delegate be furnished with a copy.

DEL. McMULLEN: Mr. President, I am opposed to this motion as I understand it, the explanation being by Del. De Leon. Now, that Executive Board, as I comprehend it, will be a matter of five men, and if those five men say and decide that a thing has to be done and incorporated into the constitution, and that it was the act of this convention, why, it is a fact and cannot be denied by any one, and there is no appeal by any one from it. And naturally that brings forth the necessity of Bro. Ryan's contention as to having everybody know what those are. On the other hand, there is this condition that arises: If they say that the style, may it please you, of this constitution is of thus and such an order, though that was not the act of this convention, it will change the entire book to conform to it. Now, there would not have been any necessity for a convention meeting if we just simply had a committee on style elected by the last convention, if this prevails; because those fixed men's opinions will be the opinions that we will have to abide by for the next twelve months of the life of this organization. I hope this will not pass. I hope this convention will not adopt this. I hope that the amendments that have prevailed will be printed in the manner and form they are to take when appearing in the constitution, and I most heartily desire that the new amendment or incorporation—I don't hear any amendment—of Bro. Ryan will prevail, so that we may know what the actual acts of this convention were. Now, I know it is impossible, and you have not that almighty power to determine what is in that brother's mind or what might be in other minds today. It would be impossible to determine what might be in them in a month from now, and therefore there is no standard set as to what the style shall be regulated by. They would have the right to determine that it shall be this, that or anything. Anything that they determine must go in there, and anything that they say must come out of there. There is no limit set as to what shall come out. There is no specification to determine how far they shall use their ideas, and I for one say this: If the ideas which permeate this convention are to go back to the membership, for heaven's sake don't leave it in the hands of five men. I shall vote against this.

DEL. SCHWEINBURG: I myself am opposed to a committee on style. It is going to be very easily done if the Committee on Constitution will take the thing in hand and give us a final report when we are through with their amendments to the constitution; if they would take the amendments and insert them in the constitution where they belong, so that the whole constitution could be read off here on the floor of the convention and be adopted or rejected, as the case may be, and everybody knows where the changes are that are going in and where the constitution stands.

DEL. MOORE: I understand that this amendment of Bro. Ryan has been mixed up with this style proposition, and that that is all one. There is a section there, if the Secretary will read it.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Secretary will read it as it has been amended.

DEL. KINNEALLY (reading): "Resolved, that all clauses or words

in conflict with the amendments adopted by this convention are hereby annulled, and the General Executive Board is instructed to act as a committee on style in the preparation of the amended constitution, and that each delegate be furnished with a printed copy of the amendments to the constitution for the I. W. W. which have been adopted by this convention, before the adjournment of the convention."

DEL. MOORE: I move to segregate Comrade Ryan's amendment from the other.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there a second to that?

DEL. McMULLEN: I wish to second that. I desire to vote for Ryan's and against the other.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair will order it separated then. The portion of the recommendation of the Committee on Constitution that is before the house at this time is that portion on the Executive Board acting as a committee on style. The Secretary will call the roll.

DEL. DE LEON: Shall we take a vote first on the Ryan amendment?

DEL. FOX: It is the amendment, I take it, first, of Ryan.

DEL. DE LEON: It is the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair put the committee's recommendation before the convention first. Now, if there is any objection you can have either of them first. Which one do you want?

DELEGATES: Ryan's.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will have Ryan's.

DEL. MARKLEY: Unanimous consent.

DEL. FISCHER: I ask for unanimous consent.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection to the adoption of Del. Ryan's amendment?

DELEGATES: No.

DEL. HALL: It has not been read yet.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Secretary will read Del. Ryan's amendment.

DEL. KINNEALLY (reading): "That each delegate be furnished with a printed copy of the amendments to the constitution for the I. W. W. which have been adopted by this convention, before the adjournment of the convention."

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any objections to the adoption of this?

DELEGATES: None.

THE CHAIRMAN: Then the Chair will declare that it is unanimously passed.

DEL. McMULLEN: What is that?

THE CHAIRMAN: Del. Ryan's amendment. The vote now occurs upon the recommendation of the Committee on Constitution regarding the incoming General Executive Board acting as a committee on style. The Secretary will call the roll.

DEL. McKNIGHT: I wish again to refer to two resolutions introduced by myself in the Constitution Committee regarding two proposed amendments to the constitution. I have heard no word of them, and since they are from four different locals I think they are entitled to some consideration.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Constitution Committee is not through yet.

DEL. McKNIGHT: I understand this vote was on concurring in their report and that that was the end of their report.

THE CHAIRMAN: No.

The roll was then called and resulted: Total vote, 584; yes, 298; no, 286.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is carried and the amendment adopted.

## LOCAL BOARD STENOGRAPHIC REPORT.

DEL. KINNEALLY: Mr. Chairman and delegates, you will find in Bro. Riordan's report that article or paragraph which we have adopted in reference to the local Executive Board. Now, attached to that article is also a recommendation which, without it, that article is void of any good; that is, the good that we expect and hope to accrue from that very article. We recommend that this recommendation be adopted: "That a stenographic report of the deliberations of the local board be taken, and, together with the monthly financial report, be submitted monthly to the General Executive Board and to all unions."

It was moved and seconded that the section be adopted.

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been regularly moved and seconded that the clause just reported by the Constitution Committee referring to a stenographic report of the meetings of the local Executive Board be adopted. If there is no delegate who wishes to be recorded in the negative the Chair will order this carried unanimously.

DEL. McKNIGHT: I object.

THE CHAIRMAN: Del. McKnight wishes to be recorded voting in the negative. Any other delegate? If not, the motion to concur is carried.

DEL. KINNEALLY, of the Constitution Committee: That is all.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any other committees?

## COMMITTEE ON REPORTS OF OFFICERS.

DEL. SHENKAN: I would like again to call your attention to what I stated in reference to the Committee on Reports of Officers.

THE CHAIRMAN: What delegates are not serving on that committee?

DEL. SHENKAN: Well, judging from appearances there is one who has gone home; at least I cannot find him around the convention any more.

THE CHAIRMAN: How many delegates are serving? How many of the committee are acting?

DEL. SHENKAN: There are three so far that have served at every meeting that we have held here.

THE CHAIRMAN: Can't you get along with three and bring in a report?

DEL. SHENKAN: One of the three says he can't act at night, even.

DEL. PINKERTON: As one of the Committee on Reports of Officers I tried to attend those meetings and I stayed up until one o'clock at night. Whenever they hold a meeting after 8 o'clock in the evening I can't get home until one o'clock in the morning. I got home at one o'clock this morning and I had to hustle like the dickens to get home and get up at six. If this convention adjourns till Monday and the committee meets tomorrow I will give it the whole day as one of the three. If we have to carry it on in the evening I cannot consistently do it any longer.

DEL. SIMS: There is the report also of the Committee on Good and Welfare, and I believe there ought to be action taken on that.

DEL. SHENKAN: Action ought to be taken on one committee at a time before any other committee is acted on.

DEL. McCUE: I am a member of that Committee on Officers' Reports, and I would like to suggest here to the other members of the committee that if we arrange to meet tomorrow, provided the convention does not convene tomorrow, let us make our arrangements for that right after the adjournment of this session.

DEL. DUNCAN: The Committee on Ways and Means is ready to report and has a report signed. The last I saw of it it was in the hands of Bro. Mullady. I don't know whether he is in the house now or not.

THE CHAIRMAN: Del. Shenkan has asked the Chair to either discharge the committee or refill and replace some other delegates on that committee. Now, the Chair does not care to discharge this committee, but will call for suggestions for delegates to act on this committee.

DEL. DUNCAN: Do you mean the Committee on Ways and Means?

THE CHAIRMAN: The Committee on Officers' Reports.

DEL. ABBOTT: The chairman of that committee has gone home, I understand.

THE CHAIRMAN: That does not destroy the committee.

DEL. ROGERS: I move that the Chair appoint additional members.

THE CHAIRMAN: A motion is not necessary. The Chair does not know what delegates are on the committees; he has not got a list of the committees here.

DEL. KLEESE: Here they are. (Handing a list to the Chairman.)

A DELEGATE: I suggest Comrade Tullar.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair will appoint Comrade Tullar to act on the Committee on Officers' Reports in place of Del. Motherwell. That only leaves Del. Pinkerton, who cannot serve, and it seems to me the balance of those delegates on that committee can report: Delegates Shenkan, McCue, Abbott and Tullar.

DEL. SIMS: I would like to say that the Committee on Good and Welfare has not got together. Del. Smith of New Orleans is out of the city, and that leaves a vacancy on that committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: It seems to me that that committee can act with these members, Delegates Sims, Holmes, Heslewood and Moore, without Del. Smith. Under the order of business adopted the next committee to report is the Resolution Committee. Is the Resolution Committee ready to make any report?

DEL. HENDRICKS: As Chairman of that committee I will state that Secretary Ryan has the resolutions.

THE CHAIRMAN: Have you any report to make?

DEL. RYAN: The resolutions were turned over to the Committee on Style here, and none can be made. I would like to state that we report progress.

THE CHAIRMAN: Has the Committee on Ways and Means any report to make?

DEL. DUNCAN: The Committee on Ways and Means has prepared its report and it is signed by all the delegates. The last I saw of it it was in the hands of Del. Mullady. If he is in the house I wish he would produce it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Auditing Committee.

DEL. FOX: The Auditing Committee is not yet ready to report.

THE CHAIRMAN: Has the Committee on Education and Literature any report to make?

DEL. FRENCH: We report progress. I understand that Bro. Ahern is here. Del. McKnight informs me that Del. Ahern refuses to act any more on the committee. But previous to that we had drawn up a portion of our report and will be able to report in full soon as Bro. Dumas makes his appearance at the hall, and we cannot report until then.

DEL. DE LEON: Is that a principal report or a report consisting of several parts?

DEL. FRENCH: It consists of parts, but the point is this. We have passed upon those things and had a whole forenoon session, and after having passed upon them myself and Del. McKnight acted as a Commit-



tee on Style that we have heard so much about, so as to put it in shape, and we must get Bro. Dumas' sanction to the wording.

THE CHAIRMAN: Has the Committee on Strikes and Grievances any report to make?

Del. Forberg on behalf of the committee submitted the following report:

#### REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON STRIKES AND GRIEVANCES.

The Committee on Strikes and Grievances having considered all matters submitted to it wishes to make the following report:

First.—The case of Chas. Bock, now in jail at Portland, Oregon. We find that Bock was a member of the A. F. of L. at the time of his trouble, and that all matters concerning his case that were submitted to the committee were of such a vague and unsatisfactory nature, that it would be impossible to act intelligently at such a distance. Therefore we recommend that this matter be referred to the I. W. W. Local of Portland, Ore., and let them take what action they find necessary.

Second.—We find that the Tobacco Workers' Industrial Union No. 89 of Cleveland, Ohio, was involved in the autumn of 1905, in a serious strike at a time when the general organization had no funds for strike benefit. They incurred a debt of over a thousand dollars on the promise of the General Executive Board to pay the debt as soon as there was sufficient money to do so. The general organization has already paid three hundred and fifty dollars (\$350.00). We find the union has been in a continual struggle with the employers since the beginning of the year, so that they have been compelled to use their funds for the support of their members who were out of employment.

Therefore, we recommend that the General Executive Board be instructed to pay the remainder of the debt.

Third.—Resolution No. 38 in reference to the Metal Department was referred to Committee on Constitution.

Fourth.—Resolution No. 22 in reference to the imprisonment of Brothers Moyer, Haywood and Pettibone, was referred to the Committee on Resolutions.

Fifth.—No. 56, a letter from Silk Workers' Industrial Union No. 190 shows that the silk workers have had a long strike with very little support from the general organization. About the middle of August an appeal was sent out from the General Office to all local unions of the I. W. W. for money to support all workers of the I. W. W. on strike. Immediately afterward an appeal issued by a strike committee of the Industrial Council and the Window Washers of Chicago was sent out asking for funds to support the striking Window Washers of Chicago. This appeal was sent to local unions, notwithstanding that the Window Washers were included in the appeal from the General Office and that the General Executive Board refused to sanction their action in issuing a special appeal for the Window Washers. The committee is unable to determine whether the action of the Joint Strike Committee is responsible for the small amount of money paid to the striking silk workers or not. But to avoid such mistakes in the future we wish to make the following recommendation:

Strikes shall be considered legal and entitled to assistance from the general organization only when endorsed by the local Industrial Union,

the Industrial Council, if such exists in locality where strike occurs, and the General Executive Board.

Respectfully submitted,

J. M. BROWN, Chairman.  
W. J. ROGERS.  
LILLIAN M. FORBERG.  
PHILIP VEAL.  
H. V. JACKSON.

THE CHAIRMAN: What shall be done with the report?

DEL. AUGUSTINE: I move to concur. (Seconded.)

DEL. HOLMES: I wish to know more about that portion relating to Bock. His two locals that I represent have instructed me to bring this to the attention of Secretary Trautmann. Bock is now sentenced to six years in jail. This is not a matter of child's play, and referring it to the local in Portland means that absolutely nothing will be done and the man will remain there. We brought it before this convention for the purpose of asking you to take some action, yea or nay, in the matter, and not refer it. Suppose the local in Portland does take action, what can they do? They want the support of this body. I ask you to consider the fact that this is a wage earner in jail sentenced to six years in jail at the behest of the ship owners. Whether he belongs to the A. F. of L. or not, that is true. And hundreds of others in the I. W. W., law-abiding citizens of the working class, ask you to take some action. If this is referred to Portland and the body in convention assembled endorses that report, I wish my protest entered on the minutes.

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been regularly moved and seconded that the report of the Committee on Strikes and Grievances be concurred in. You have heard the motion, are you ready for the question?

DEL. SCHWEINBURG: Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the recommendation of the Committee on Strikes and Grievances so far as the endorsement of strikes is concerned. If those strikes are right we would go a long way to gain something. That local union in the city of Chicago and the men employed in Chicago have some grievance which cannot be settled by the local union and the position of the members of the local union is that if we cannot get the concessions we are asking for we will have to go out and fight for them. Then certainly it is the duty of the district council to take the matter in hand and try to settle or call the men out on strike. But if they would wait till the General Executive Board gives its consent too much valuable time is lost, and then our men who have gone out on strike will simply lose the strike. For if you must first have the general consent of the local Executive Board or local union in New York or New Orleans before you can call the men out on strike when they have consent already from their respective councils in the cities, then certainly we can never gain any strikes for our men, as too much time is lost if you wait to get endorsement.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair would suggest to save time that we take up the report of the committee seriatim.

The report was by consent taken up seriatim. The first section of the report in regard to the Bock case, recommending that it be referred to Local Portland, was reread.

DEL. DRESSLER: I move that this convention go on record giving Bro. Bock of Portland, Ore., all moral and financial assistance from the I. W. W. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been regularly moved and seconded that the report of the Committee on Strikes and Grievances in regard to the

case of Bro. Bock of Portland, Ore., be not concurred in, and that this convention instruct the General Executive Board of the I. W. W. to grant Bro. Bock all the moral and financial assistance necessary. You have heard the motion, are you ready for the question?

DEL. FRENCH: I want through the Chair to ask Del. Holmes if it is true that this man Bock was also acting in the capacity of walking delegate, lining up men for the Coast Seamen's pure and simple union.

DEL. HOLMES: He was acting in the capacity of business agent for the Coast Seamen's Union.

DEL. FRENCH: That is what I would like to know.

DEL. HOLMES: As I was instructed to bring this up I would like to say a few words. We can dismiss the case in very quick manner, but that does not answer the proposition. Bro. Bock was a member of the Industrial Workers of the World in Los Angeles, in Local No. 12, and used to go to San Pedro where there was also a local, and he was working hard for the Industrial Workers of the World and speaking for it, and did his best to distribute literature. He went to Portland and was also a member of the Coast Seamen's Union. Anybody that knows the conditions on the Pacific Coast knows that it would be impossible to work along the Pacific as a seaman unless you go in the Pacific Coast Seamen's Union. It embraces the whole Pacific Coast. It is true he was acting as business agent. I don't agree with that at all; I strenuously object to it. But I want to say that there is nothing except an unwritten law that prohibits a man doing that. This man was arrested on suspicion that he fired into a vessel where there was a bunch of scabs. There were eighteen men supposed to be involved in that. They railroaded this man to jail. They got a load of witnesses and took every possible advantage. The man had a poor lawyer and couldn't get witnesses, and he was sentenced to six years. He is now in Multanomah County jail, waiting a chance to get a new trial. We did the best we could. We wrote to Secretary Trautmann, and he advised us to bring it before this convention. It seems to me we have got to look further than that business agent proposition, which I don't like and I don't believe in. There is a member of the working class being railroaded off to jail for six years. He is not a leader or anything; he is a working man and a member of that class, and I maintain that it is our duty to stand by that class irrespective of that business agent proposition. We went to work in our mixed local in the West, and which I am glad we did, and stood up for Brothers Moyer and Haywood to the best of our ability. We got up a big meeting and sent them all the money we could possibly raise, and I maintain that although this is a humble member, although this question of business agent does come in, that on the principle of working class solidarity we should at least stand by him to the extent that we object to his being railroaded off to jail. Now, as to the proposition to refer to the Portland local, which is prejudiced against the man. They have entered a protest against him. In the name of all that it good and bad, how can you consistently refer it to an organization that is prejudiced against him? It is a small organization. They are not doing very much. They haven't got any means to do anything, and this body should go on record and a protest should be got up with signatures upon it. The man never asked for financial assistance. It was Local 12 that asked for that. He asked for moral support, and I think the Industrial Workers of the World should get up a protest over its signature with regard to his false imprisonment, asking for a new trial or to get him out of jail. I want to tell you it is no joke to be sentenced for six years. We may dismiss it by referring it back to Portland, Ore., but I maintain that this rep-

representative body of working men should take this up and stand by the working class.

DEL. FORBERG: Mr. Chairman—

DEL. KLEESE: I would like to answer that.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair will recognize Del. Forberg.

DEL. FORBERG: I just want to say that the committee had no idea of relegating this man to jail for six years, but we wanted to get at the truth of the matter from what submitted to us. We thought that the I. W. W. local in Portland, Ore., would be better able to get the information that would clear up the matter and as to whether the man was justly entitled to support from the I. W. W. or not. It was our idea that if we referred the matter to them and the information that they could furnish was of such a nature that it proved that there was no conspiracy against the I. W. W. back of his connection with the I. W. W., that we would be perfectly willing to give him the financial support necessary. We felt that we could trust the General Executive Board of the Industrial Workers of the World to support any members of the Industrial Workers of the World who were in trouble, and that was our reason and our only reason for asking that it be referred to them as being the only parties that could give the information. If you go through the mass of stuff that was read here and submitted to us you will see that it was simply a repetition of the fact that the man had been arrested and put in prison, without any real reason why he should ask us for support. We the committee do not wish to desert any man who is in trouble, whether he is a member of the I. W. W. or not, but if any man who is simply a business agent of the American Federation of Labor simply wishes to unite with the I. W. W. in order to force the I. W. W. into a fight, then we are not going to support that sort of thing.

DEL. KLEESE: Mr. Chairman and fellow delegates, I have been brought into this in a roundabout way by Bro. Holmes stating that Portland was prejudiced against this man Bock. Now, I want to state for myself as a member of Local Portland that I am not prejudiced against any member of the working class.

DEL. HOLMES: I have not alluded to Bro. Kleese at all.

THE CHAIRMAN: Del. Kleese has the floor.

DEL. KLEESE: And I want further to state that if it is the pleasure of this convention and of the Committee on Grievances that his case be referred to Portland I will do all within my power to see that his case gets all the attention that we can give it. Now, just a few words in regard to his actions in the past. While in Portland I was told that he came to Portland as a member of the I. W. W. and that he took no active part in the I. W. W., but on the other hand he did line himself up as business agent with the Sailors' Union. Now, I drew from that that he was an American Federation of Labor man at heart and incidentally an Industrial Worker. The members at Portland seem not to favor his case very heartily; what their reason is I do not know. I know that the members of Portland are good, honest and true men, that are free from prejudice and are working hard in the interest of the working class. If his case is referred to Local Portland I will do all in my power to see that the man gets justice, but I must say while I am on the floor that I am opposed to the motion to give him all support possible. That would mean to surrender the entire treasury of the Industrial Workers of the World to his case.

DEL. MOSKOVITZ: Mr. Chairman, I rise to make an amendment, and my amendment is that the case of Bock be referred to the incoming administration, they to find out the particulars of the case and act to

the best of their understanding. If my amendment is seconded I think only a few minutes will be necessary to give you my reasons for this amendment. (Seconded.)

**THE CHAIRMAN:** It has been regularly moved and seconded as an amendment that the case of Bro. Bock be referred to the incoming administration, and that they investigate the case and take such steps as their judgment deems necessary.

**DEL. MOSKOVITZ:** Mr. Chairman, almost every delegate, without an exception, I think, in this convention, will realize that this case is a very important one. As Del. Holmes states, although this man may be even an agent of the American Federation of Labor, still he belongs to our class; he belongs to the class of wage workers, and for this reason alone we ought to give our attention to him, whether he is a member of the I. W. W. or not. And still, while being a member, we ought to know at least the position and the real point as to why he joined the I. W. W. Your committee really could not act better than it did and could not make any other recommendation to this convention. But the motion made here that it shall be referred to that local in Portland will serve the purpose. I therefore make this amendment, comrades, that it shall be sent back at least to the incoming administration. They will have a chance to inquire in the matter fully. They will be able to survey the situation, and they will be wiser to act on the proposition. I think that is the only thing we can do under these conditions.

**DEL. AUGUSTINE:** I would like to ask for information from Bro. Holmes, through the Chair, whether the Seamen's Union that this man was a member of is doing anything for him, and to what extent.

**DEL. HOLMES:** The Seamen's Union of Portland, I believe, have helped him to a certain extent with money, but I do not think that the Pacific Coast Seamen's Union as a whole has done that. I maintain that that is more reason why we should do something. But, Bro. Chairman, I think I agree with the amendment of Bro. Moskovitz, because that would bring it before the national body. That is what I want.

**DEL. LINGENFELTER:** There are one or two phases of this question to be considered. The members of the Industrial Workers of the World are being hounded by every pure and simple official in America. We find upon the one hand that the unions attached to the American Federation of Labor are right and left throughout the length and breadth of this country and Canada levying fines upon members of their organization for daring to advocate industrialism. I myself have fallen a victim to that very class of men, and I know as I stand here that that same class of men—I mean the Cigarmakers' Union of the American Federation of Labor—will certainly brand me as a scab if I do not pay their fine or tribute. But that is neither here nor there. This man was a member of the American Federation of Labor union and he is up against the capitalist and its law. He has a chance of going to the penitentiary, due to the fact of that rotten scabby organization. Now, notwithstanding that these labor fakirs take some of the best men they have got and call them yellow dog Socialists, sneaking Socialists, cowards and so on and fine them, I say we should set an example, and instead of getting back at them in the same manner, we should go to work and support to the best of our ability a man like this man Bock and thus hurl back in the teeth of those cowardly scabs to show them that we are not scabs and show that we will not leave him go to the penitentiary without our backing that appeal.

**DEL. McKINNON:** There is another side to this case, and that is this: This man Bock has been acting as business agent of the Seamen's Union. The Seamen's Union are fighting the capitalist class. The ship

owners of Portland and the boarding house masters have an organization. A sailor comes in with two or three hundred dollars, and the boarding house masters manage to rob him of his money, and then when he has no more to pay they ship him off on a capitalist ship and they take what they call an advance note that the poor sailor must sign, amounting to perhaps three months' wages, and he goes to sea for perhaps five or six months, and he has been working in that ship three months before he has a cent coming to him. That system is backed up by the capitalist class of Oregon as well as the capitalists of New York. I know as a positive fact that Bock has been up against the boarding house masters of Oregon and Portland as well, and for that reason the boarding house masters have been successful in railroading that man to jail, and I for one will not only give the support of my organization but my own support to try and have that man liberated; and I think it is no more than right that the amendment should prevail that the Executive Board be given full power to act on behalf of this man who is in jail. I know how it is. I have been up against the same system myself.

THE CHAIRMAN: If there are no objections to the unanimous consent of the house to this amendment the Chair will declare it carried. It is so ordered.

#### TOBACCO WORKERS' STRIKE.

The second section of the report was read, as follows:

"We find that the Tobacco Workers' Industrial Union 87 of Cleveland, Ohio, were involved in the autumn of 1905 in a serious fight at a time when the general organization had no funds for strike benefits. They incurred a debt of over \$1,000 on the promise of the General Executive Board to pay the debt just as soon as there was sufficient money to do so. The general organization has already paid \$350. We find also that the union has been in a continuous struggle with the employers since the beginning of the year, so that they have been compelled to use their funds for the support of their members who are out of employment. Therefore we recommend that the General Executive Board be instructed to pay the remainder of the debt."

It was moved and seconded that the recommendation of the committee be adopted.

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been regularly moved and seconded that this portion of the report of the Committee on Strikes and Grievances be adopted. Are there any remarks?

A DELEGATE: Unanimous.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: There is a question I want to ask. Is there a stipulated time when this debt should be liquidated?

DEL. FORBERG: As soon as possible.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: All right.

DEL. McMULLEN: I recall something of this matter coming up in the Credentials Committee, where it was stated that the reason the dues of this union were not paid in here was for the reason alleged right here. Now, as I understand it we are now agreeing to accept the report of this committee that we will pay to them the balance of the \$1,000, less this \$350, or a matter of say \$700. We are now agreeing to incur an indebtedness and ordering the Executive Board to pay to that union \$700 or thereabouts. Now, as I understand it, they were to advance that and then it was to be considered by this organization as payment of dues and liquidated in that manner. I cannot vote for the recommendation of this committee in that way, because I do not believe that when this condition was created under those circumstances but what it should be carried out in that manner. I won't say positively, but I think

I heard the Secretary-Treasurer say something to this effect, and I think that is the question right now.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: The debt of the Tobacco Workers' Union of Cleveland should be liquidated as quickly as possible, because the money has been advanced by slaves, by men who need the money, and who, or rather part of them, were since last year on strike continually. The stogie workers of Cleveland, when organized, were immediately confronted by an organized resistance on the part of the employers. The employers of Cleveland, unorganized before, immediately formed an association. You will find that in the record of the Executive Board meetings. The I. W. W. was then without any funds. The General Executive Board authorized the President to call a mass meeting of those on strike and others in Cleveland, and in that mass meeting full support was guaranteed. A week after that a request was made for money, and the I. W. W. had no money in those days. I was sent to Cleveland and conferred with the Executive Board of the Cleveland strikers. The strikers themselves were not aware of the fact that the I. W. W. was without finances at that time. Going over the situation we found that the strike could have been won, but we could not, nor the Executive Board of the tobacco workers of Cleveland could not reveal the true situation to the strikers, so as not to discourage them in their good fight that they had made against the employers of labor in Cleveland. Members of the Executive Board of the Tobacco Workers' Union of Cleveland agreed to advance the money to pay the next week's strike benefit. They agreed without even a note. They agreed that they would advance the money and go hungry before they would see the strike of those men and women lost, and on that promise that they were to advance the money a note was given—a personal note by the way—that within six months from the date of the making of that note the full indebtedness would be liquidated. The money advanced to the strikers of Cleveland was advanced by members of the same organization. Some of them paid \$5, some \$10, and some of them who had saved up \$200 advanced the \$200, and I believe one advanced \$250, and the money was paid and the strikers were never made acquainted with the fact that that money that was paid in strike benefits was paid by members of their own organization. The General Secretary-Treasurer, as our minutes will show, was made acquainted with these conditions. It was then agreed that we would allow that organization to collect the dues and gradually liquidate the debt if possible from the dues collected from the members. They started out paying off the debt in that way. Then came the strike in Pennsylvania. The stogie workers quit in the East. Jenkinson started a fight against the working class, and it was the duty of the Industrial Workers of the World to take up that fight. In that factory there were about thirty members of Local 189 in Cleveland engaged, and the local in Cleveland immediately to pay regular strike benefits to them. The members in Cleveland paid regular strike benefits from their meager earnings. They could not then start to liquidate that debt. Another strike came then in the Goodenow cigar factory. Again they appealed for funds. We could not raise them any funds because the situation did not permit the General Executive Board to advance any more money, and they paid it again from their own earnings and supported the strike. Now, I hold this, that these men who have advanced the money should be paid. I know as a matter of fact that some of them were out on strike for ten weeks.

THE CHAIRMAN: Your time is up.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: All right, I give away.

**DEL. ROTKOVITZ:** Mr. Chairman and fellow delegates, I am a delegate sent here to represent the Tobacco Workers of Cleveland. I will not take up the time now to inform you of all that has happened in the city of Cleveland in the last twelve months, or to inform you to a certain extent of the struggle that the Tobacco Workers of Cleveland have been having for the last eight or nine months after the strike; that the General Secretary has informed us already. Three months after the strike last year, in 1905, the employers formed an alliance and determined to break that organization, a part of the I. W. W. But we, the tobacco workers of Cleveland, having experience for a number of years and being filled with the spirit of industrialism, and realizing the position financially that the I. W. W. was in, determined to carry the burden on our own shoulders, and we did. Of course we sent word first to the headquarters, and they informed us how they stood. At that time we spent \$175, after being out on strike five weeks, and after some of the men who knew the situation advanced the money as the General Secretary told us a minute ago. Still we were not discouraged. But the bosses, as he said, had determined to break the organization, and they would not give us more work than from four to five hours a day where the men could not make more than a dollar a day, and we had about 200 members at that time belonging to the organization. A majority of them were married men and did not earn more than \$5 or \$6 a week. At the same time 40 members were locked out in one factory in the city of Cleveland and we have assessed ourselves in order to support those men. But that was not the end of it. The bosses continued with their determination to crush the organization. Then in about four weeks later another firm did the same thing. They did not dare to come out openly as they did the first time in 1905, but they were conducting a guerrilla war, they were trying to do just skirmishing. We took it up that time without asking any relief from headquarters, and we assessed ourselves from the wages that we had been earning at that time of \$5 to \$6. Seven dollars was the most that was earned by any man, and we have supported those men as well as we could, and that is the way we have kept on struggling till the present day. But the struggle today is not a struggle for better wages; it is not a struggle to make 50 cents to a dollar a week more. It is a struggle for the principle of industrialism, and that is what the poor working class are doing today. But in the meantime I wish to call your attention to the numbers of the Tobacco Workers. At one time we had 250 members; today we have 300 engaged in the different industries. Now I come to the question of money. At the time we had our strike in 1905 when the General Secretary came to Cleveland after Sherman was there, about five days previous to his appearance, and found the situation was satisfactory as a strike; that as a conflict it was favorable on the side of the strike, but there was no funds. He consulted with the Executive Board of the local at that time, and I was present there and a member of that board. He said to the boys, "The proposition is to advance money any way if possible." So I was the first one as a member of the board to say "I will advance \$100," and the rest of the men followed. All are married men and I am the only single one. They advanced the money at that time, about \$500. We thought the next week the strike would be through, that is, that the strike would be won. But we failed in our judgment and the strike continued for another week, and it was necessary the following week to advance money. We did the same thing, and it required another week's struggle, and finally we had no more money to advance. Notwithstanding the situation of a number of the men that time we were not discouraged, and we informed a number of men of the situation, thinking to raise, \$5, \$10,



or \$200 in order to have sufficient funds to pay the strikers, and we did. Now, as to the note, that was given by our general secretary, due after a period of six months. The six months' time expired and no money was in sight. Then a communication was received from headquarters with the consent of the executive board that the money will be paid, but that the executive board wants to make this the property of the convention. We have been waiting to bring that up, but it was put off and they were disappointed. Now the convention takes place in September and we have been disappointed and some of the men were disappointed up to the present time. Therefore I will make an amendment to the recommendation that is brought in here and move that the money shall be paid immediately. It was stated that it leaves only about \$650, but the full amount is \$745, and I move that that be paid as soon as the Industrial Workers of the World shall relieve itself from the present situation financially. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: An amendment has been offered to the recommendation of the committee that this debt of \$745 be liquidated by the incoming administration as soon as it is possible to do so. You have heard the amendment; are there any remarks?

DEL. GOSS: I wish to ask a question as to whether the \$750 is still due the Cleveland local after the last per capita tax was paid.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: According to the statement received they have paid off \$365 of the indebtedness, while they contracted a bill or debt of some \$1,200.

DEL. ROTKOWITZ: The amount in there was \$1,178.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Part of that has been paid. Some individual members knowing about this indebtedness have advanced some money, but the total amount now due, or the debt to be liquidated, amounts to about \$750, which could easily be liquidated in a month.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question? (Question called for.) If there are no objections the Chair will declare this amendment carried by unanimous consent. The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The third section of the report, in which resolution No. 38 was referred to the Committee on Constitution, was concurred in by unanimous consent.

The fourth section referring to the Constitution Committee resolution No. 22 in regard to the imprisonment of Bros. Moyer, Haywood and Pettibone, was likewise concurred in.

Section 5 of the report, relating to the situation of Silk Workers' Union No. 196, was read and a motion made to concur.

DEL. RUGG: I move an amendment to the effect that in place of saying the General Executive Board we say the Local Executive Board. (Amendment seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: A motion has been made to concur in the report of the Committee on Strikes and Grievances in regard to the Silk Workers' strike. And amendment has been made to strike out "General Executive Board" and insert the words "Local Board" in place. Are there any remarks?

#### AUTHORIZING STRIKES.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: These two strikes bring before this convention the most important function of the Industrial Workers of the World. The organization has been handicapped in the last year to a certain extent. On the other hand we find that the organization underwent so many so-called wild strikes that it is the duty of this convention to adopt such laws as will prevent the calling of strikes by the will or by the determination of two or three men. The Window Wash-

ers' strike, without any reflection being cast upon the personality or membership of that organization, is one instance of where practically one fakir could call a strike or rather precipitate or have precipitated a strike and the general organization is plunged into a conflict with employers and is forced to pay strike benefits, and the General Executive Board has not been asked whether consent is given or not. Now, in an organized body of men we must have a certain self-imposed discipline. If we did not discipline men we never would have accomplished the task before us. We have found with no exception in the last year that every strike has been called without the consent of either the industrial council or the General Executive Board, and the only notice we received was a telegram, "Send within 24 hours so and so much money or the strike will be lost." I hold that if you permit—Mr. Chairman, I don't want to be interrupted as I have only five minutes' time—

DEL. MCKINNON: Give him my time.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: I hold that industrial councils and industrial unions should be held responsible for every strike and that no strike shall be endorsed by the General Executive Board except prior to the strike the industrial council has endorsed the strike and has laid before the General Executive Board the causes for such a strike. When the Window Washers' strike was on for three or four months we found it could have been prevented and that one or two tried to prevent that strike, but it could not have been won in those days for reasons which may later on be explained. But this strike, the strike of the Silk Workers and other organizations within the I. W. W., is the fairest illustration that the membership think that if we simply go out on strike the general organization is compelled to pay. At times we did not have a solitary cent in the general office, but we would get every day a telegram to send money; but where to get the money from? We have succeeded in getting voluntary contributions or we would not have been able to pay a solitary cent in strike benefits. If you say in your recommendation that an industrial council must endorse a strike then you must also qualify such an endorsement and stipulate under what conditions the strike shall be endorsed. Otherwise we may see in the coming days one or two men precipitate a strike and send on a telegram, and the entire treasury may be depleted and money may be wasted for purposes unnecessary and uncalled for that might be used to far better advantage in the general movement of the Industrial Workers of the World.

THE CHAIRMAN: Time.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: I am sorry that I can not finish these remarks.

DEL. RICHTER: I move to give the Secretary-Treasurer further time.

DEL. McMULLEN: I was going to speak. I will give the Secretary-Treasurer my five minutes.

DEL. MARKLEY: I will give him my five minutes.

THE CHAIRMAN: All right.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Thank you. I will cite an instance before this convention. We find the Garment Workers of Buffalo organizing for the purpose of getting the textile industry of that city into the Industrial Workers of the World. If you will write to the secretary for information you will find that the labor leaders of the American Federation of Labor asked the discharge of some men in that industry because they were active in organizing the I. W. W. We will find that the advice that they should call the bluff means that they should go out on strike. They interpreted that to go out on strike; that we will

pay them two or three weeks' strike benefits, \$500 in that locality, and after the strike has been terminated, or postponed rather for a better occasion when the chances are better of winning the strike, we will find that the Garment Workers' organization is out of existence. We will take the strike of Haywood Local in Youngstown, Ohio. Although there are many illustrations this particular strike serves best in the American labor movement as an example of American Federation of Labor scabbery. Yet we find that after the organization has practically won every point, after it has whipped the entire American Federation of Labor into line, that due to the underhanded work of one or two or three men that organization ceases to be in existence. Now, if we are going to support such wild strikes as they may be called, if any individual may call a strike or if an organization may be organized and precipitate a struggle, we may just as well say, "Disband the Industrial Workers of the World." There must be a regulation. There must be some self-imposed discipline, and I hold this that those organizations formed in the last year on a strict observance of the laws and the principles of the I. W. W. did not have a strike, while those organizations organized on the craft union principle of immediate gains without voluntary co-operation of the membership, those organizations were the only ones that were plunged into a fight immediately after they were organized. (Applause.) In my letters to Toronto Comrade Reid will bear me out that I advised to let them first lose the fight under the agreement with the Federation of Labor, and from the remnants of the discouraged organization the workers will build a new one, and they will not rush into a fight high-handed and will not follow the advice of one man. They know that when a fight is started the fight must not be carried on on craft union lines, but it must be carried on on industrial lines. The very fact that strikes are manifestations of discontent should serve as a lesson how we are going to have our strikes conducted or endorsed. Strikes if not rightly conducted will be lost every time, but if the strikes are organized and carried on and called at a time when the employers of labor are less prepared you will always win. Here we find in the garment industry of New York, we find in the silk industry of Paterson that they did not ask for support because they called a strike. The strike was called when the bosses were least prepared for such action. This should be the only guidance. There was not a solitary strike that the I. W. W. won. Practically speaking even the tobacco workers' strike was not absolutely won, because we did not bide our time. We did not organize sufficiently to embrace the entire industry. If we had carried on propaganda in the right lines, then I am satisfied that every strike that we have had in the last year would have been a success instead of a failure. To organize on craft union lines, on the craft union principle for immediate gain when there is no gain in sight, with many disgruntled and impoverished working people on the streets, would simply be a repetition of the American Federation of Labor tactics. The strike of the Window Washers of Chicago is one fair example. If we could have postponed the strike a few weeks and organized the building employes in their entirety, if we could have had every man and woman from engineer down to scrub woman in one industrial union, it would not have been required to ask help because the right organization would have forced the employers to submit and grant concessions. I have made my point clear in every strike. I had the misfortune to be sent to every place where a strike was on, and I must say that I almost fought every strike because we are not as yet in a position to strike a body blow against the capitalist system. If we had an organization that was complete and was perfected

and was coherent in all its parts, the mere fact of an organization being in existence will induce the masters to open their safety valve in the shape of reform and they will come and say, "Here, we will give you concessions because if we don't you might ask for more and you might ask for all."

The endorsement by an industrial council is not sufficient. The industrial council of Chicago endorsed the strike of the Window Washers. What good was it? They simply carried on a strike on erratic, on wild lines. When the proposition was put before the industrial council to provide the funds after they had endorsed the strike what do we find? They could not raise \$20 in the city of Chicago. The Silk Workers of New York, organized only four months ago, raised within six weeks more than \$8,000. There is a difference in strikes; there is a difference in tactics; there is a difference in methods. All the endorsement of the industrial council, all the endorsement of the Executive Board will not make a strike more effective if the strike is not made from the start for the purpose of education and agitation and the proper education among the membership so that they may understand when a strike is necessary they go out with the full satisfaction that the strike will be won; but if they find it will not be won then they discipline and train the men and women so that they may at any moment decide to go back to work and bide the time until a new battle against their conditions. This proposition is on the same lines. The Constitution Committee says the endorsement of the General Executive Board is necessary. None of the strikes have asked for endorsement. There is not a solitary strike that has been endorsed by the General Executive Board except the strike of the stogie workers, and you have laid it down as a rule that no strike will take place except the membership understand why the strike has been called and they have the endorsement of the industrial council. The endorsement of the General Executive Board will mean in reality the full backing up of those who are engaged in the battle with the employing class. (Applause.)

DEL. FORBERG: I want to say that the committee realized that every word that Bro. Trautmann has said is absolutely true. We wanted to arrange that resolution in such a way that no body of men could go out on strike unless they were sure of winning. I will admit that the English is probably too broad, but that is the thing we wanted to bring up; that every part of the organization from the local industrial union to the General Executive Board should be willing that the strike should be called before it was called, was our idea; that they should be thoroughly prepared to inaugurate the strike before it was called in every instance. We thought that we could recommend something that would give the workers to understand that their strikes wouldn't be recognized, that they wouldn't be entitled to benefits unless their local union, their local industrial council and the General Executive Board should endorse such strikes, and that we would have no strikes called precipitately. We were well aware of the fact that the Window Washers' strike in the city of Chicago was illegally called and illegally carried on and that it was a strike to no purpose in any way. We have fifty men organized out of a trade that perhaps employs 600 men in the city of Chicago to fight one of the strongest aggregations of capital in the city. That sort of strike could not possibly win, and what we wanted to bring out was that the workers must get endorsement, or, if you will, that the strike must be called by the organization, including all branches of that organization from the industrial union up to the Executive Board. Now, if that can be changed in any way

to include that, that is what we want. If our English is too weak we want it changed, but I believe I am speaking for the entire committee when I say our way out was to have such an arrangement made that strikes instead of being precipitated the moment the organization is built, strikes will be so thoroughly discouraged that we will never have a strike unless it can be of an industrial character and of such a nature that a strike will not be necessary. Because when the organization is so perfected on industrial lines that they can win a strike they won't find it necessary to go on strike.

DEL. HAVER: I only want to tell you what happened during the silk workers' strike in New York. We do not want to reprimand the I. W. W. because it did not give enough support, for we did not get support that we were not really entitled to. We got \$450 during the Glendale strike and they were really not entitled to a cent. Nevertheless, the only fault that we find is in the organizers. The organizers that we have had have come to the towns and to New York City and tell us, "If you join the I. W. W. you would only be in the organization six months and you can get \$5 or \$6 a week and all that you would need—\$5 or \$6 a week strike support."

A DELEGATE: What is his name?

DEL. HAVER: I will come to his name in a little while. Now, we have a membership in Local 190 of 250 men, and those 250 men raised over \$8,000 in three months, almost all right amongst themselves. They assessed the members 10 per cent of their wages and today they still pay 5 per cent, and this from men that have been in the organization a year almost, and they have not received a cent from headquarters yet; have they, Bro. Trautmann?

SEC. TRAUTMANN: I sent \$1,300 to New York on that lockout.

DEL. HAVER: When?

SEC. TRAUTMANN: The last \$300 was sent day before yesterday.

DEL. HAVER: I did not know anything of it. Well, notwithstanding all that, I got information that Organizer Shurtleff still continued to be organizing in New York and was to be sent to the different mills for the purpose of organizing. We have been bamboozled once too often. Our people will still believe until I get back home that there are 170,000 members in the I. W. W. as it was told us by the organizer. They also believe that they are entitled to \$5 or \$6 a week benefits after they have been organized six months. I was under the same belief until we got the constitution. These things were all told us before we had the constitution. Lots of people never read the constitution and go by what they heard from the organizer. Of course, when they come to look at the strike reports lots of people are dissatisfied. They say, "What is the use of belonging to the organization? Why should we exchange one organization for another?" Rather than go into every new one that comes along they think they had better back out and go into the old one. "Since we have got to go down in our pockets to the extent of seven or eight thousand dollars and support ourselves what is the use for the I. W. W. Let us keep up the Silk Workers' Union as we used to?" But I don't want you to think that everybody thinks that way. It is only a class that exists in every trade, who only want to join something to get something out of it; who will go on believing that if they pay so much they may expect to get so much out of it. But there are lots of men with that idea. I don't want you to think that they are all so mercenary. You must not think the few thousand dollars that we raised was all that was paid. In lots of factories where our men are employed men would come to the bosses and tell them

that those men didn't belong to the organization and they would be forced out and could not work with them. There was a situation that arose where out of 175 men 80 men refused to remain, and they were forced out. But as to Organizer Shurtleff, I have a personal grievance against him for he would use unusual tactics and didn't tell the truth as to the situation, and the men in the silk works not being told everything were misled as to the membership because they were led to believe that there was 170,000 membership in the I. W. W. and they will ask, "Why haven't we got money in the treasury with this membership?" Naturally if I go back and tell them and they find they have been fooled they will say, "We are not going into the organization because we did not get the five or six dollars that we were entitled to."

THE CHAIRMAN: Your time is up.

A DELEGATE: Grant him more time.

DEL. HAVER: I only wish to say a few more words. I would just like to give the delegates an instance here of how strikes are conducted. It is all right for Bro. Trautmann to say that strikes should be endorsed by the industrial council and also by the local board and Executive Board. That is very good. But strikes are forced on us in our business because we have a very peculiar business. We have what they call a fashion trade, running a short time and shutting down. We have got to strike while the iron is hot, because we are only busy a few weeks and whatever is done must be done quickly. To some of you people that don't know, I think Bro. French might explain the way we get around to organize. As soon as someone knows we have got an organization he wants to be recognized and supported during the lockouts. You can't get away from them. What are you going to do with men like that? You are simply up against something that we have been up against for years. If we are not entitled to support from the organization, naturally we have to go down in our own pockets and support these very men. These lockouts generally occur in the new organization where they have just organized a new shop, and naturally, not being in the organization six months they are not entitled to anything. Now, I found an instance at New York where it was represented that this organization in three years would have 300,000 membership. But the people in the East and New York City don't know anything about this. All they see is the financial report, and the financial report don't come down and state facts. It don't itemize the expense by putting down so much expenses for this and so much expense for that. They don't know how it happens, nevertheless they are not kicking about that, but I hope this convention will take some action in regard to the lockout business wherever it may come up in the future. The silk bosses have found out we are strong. We have a fine organization, and even if the Industrial Workers don't know anything about this they have done more business up to the present time than any other organization in the silk industry I ever belonged to.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: I just want to speak of two points, because these two points are important for the guidance of this convention. Is it not a matter of fact that false representations as to the conditions in the I. W. W. induced, in two instances, the silk workers to strike?

DEL. HAVER: Yes.

DEL. DE LEON: Through false representation?

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Through false representation. That does not mean by whom. I won't mention the name right here. Is it not a matter of fact that every lockout of the silk workers was endorsed and supported by the I. W. W. General Executive Board? Well, now, my first point is this, that we must remove the possibility of calling these

wild strikes, and my second point is that we must, even with a defeat in Glendale, make it an eventual victory. Now, the general strike in that one company alone has served the employers in New York City and Paterson a most striking object lesson. I learned today that the employers in the silk industry have more respect for the I. W. W., and if we had \$1,000 more to support the strikers that strike would have been won. Isn't that the fact?

DEL. HAVER: No. If we had \$50,000 more it would not have been won, and I will tell you why.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Then I am mistaken.

DEL. HAVER: The man against whom we struck is worth fifteen million dollars, and he didn't care if we spent ever so much money, we never could have won the strike. He can fill up the factory, and you can never win a strike after the factory is filled up.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Have we ever been notified of these conditions in New York?

DEL. HAVER: I don't know whether you were notified of them or not.

DEL. VEAL: Mr. Chairman and fellow delegates, as one of the Committee on Strikes and Lockouts I will say that we recognized all this that has been brought out in the discussion regarding these wild strikes, and the intention in bringing this before this convention was that the connection should be made from the local unions to the industrial councils; that the industrial councils should be responsible for what took place in this town or locality, and where there is no industrial council there ought to be some connection made, and that with the General Executive Board. But, as this delegate states, here is a question of a lockout, and when you have a lockout you can't refer it away to headquarters. They have got to take immediate action, and when that immediate action is taken it has to be taken right there and it has to be by the industrial council, and let them consult on the matter. So that you need a provision to cover a case where a condition is forced on them, where they have to act immediately. We recognized that that was the condition last year where we have been forced into strikes along the line of pure and simple principles. Therefore I think it would be wise for this convention to make provision or amend these recommendations so that in case of a lockout where immediate action is to be taken it would not be necessary to refer to the Executive Board only when they had taken action and asked their support regarding the condition which obtained there, and the general organization to go on record supporting the local and the industrial council by sustaining the strikers in a condition of that kind.

DEL. FITZGERALD: Mr. Chairman and fellow delegates, I have been in the city of Chicago for about three months, and I believe I know something about the Chicago strike of the Window Washers, and when we advise with those people we find what? We find that those men that went out on strike were trained by the very men that were getting 40 cents on the dollar to get the membership into that organization; that is the Window Washers' strike; Cranston, McSweeney and others. We find that when this man McSweeney, the conductor of the Window Washers, was refused payment by the General Secretary-Treasurer for his \$20 a week—

DEL. AUGUSTINE: A point of order. What is the motion before the house? I don't know if the speakers have heard the motion before the house.

DEL. DRESSLER: I want to call a point of order on the speaker.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair will rule that the speaker will confine

his remarks to the motion. I believe, if I understand it, that the motion has been amended, has it not, that the words "Local Executive Board" be inserted as well as the "General Executive Board?"

DEL. AUGUSTINE: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: And that the recommendation should otherwise be concurred in.

DEL. MARKLEY: Instead of the General Executive Board. The amendment was that "Local Executive Board" be put in place of "General."

THE CHAIRMAN: The amendment is that the words "Local Executive Board" be inserted in place of "General Executive Board." That is the amendment.

DEL. FITZGERALD: Now, then, what is before this body of men is the effect of the impression that has gone out, and what is the cause that created that effect? It is because of men representing this as an organization of immediate demands. That being the case, we must devise some ways and means of instructing this General Executive Board that a man that will be permitted to go on the soap box or get out and talk for the Industrialists of the World, must put forth the fundamental principles of industrialism without any immediate demands to these men, and without having the authority to say to these men "If you organize we will do so and so for you and you can get so much money in such a length of time;" that we will not permit anybody to go out from this organization to mislead its membership. Now, that being the case, that being the cause of all the trouble in the past year, I say that this is a fundamental principle; this is a thing that will destroy this organization unless we rectify it at this convention. Therefore I say this, that we must instruct this General Executive Board or the local unions that we propose to send men who will stand out for industrial unionism, who will explain industrial unionism in concrete form, and who will not put before the membership any immediate demands.

DEL. REID: The city of Toronto has been mentioned here today, and it bears directly on this question of whether we shall have what might be called a check on calling strikes. Now, from the experience that we have had at Toronto we have been fighting the idea of the Shurtleffs, who were imbued with the idea that the number of locals that we organize was the whole thing, and we want to say to those at the head that we want men who have the capacity to organize on industrial lines. Now, if you have men out in the organizing field who will instruct or who will put the principles of industrial unionism before the rank and file in the proper manner. I contend that you will have no trouble with strikes; you will have none of that thing. We in the city of Toronto do all voluntary organizing, and we have what is called a local of metal workers, and they are organized entirely out of one factory. We have leaders in the A. F. of L. who say that one of the first things men do after they organize is that they want to go on strike. There has been no such manifestation in our local. Why? Because they have been taught the proper principles of industrial unionism, and they recognize that they are to organize at the present stage of the game. If you have men going out in the Shurtleff style—I take him as a type. I don't know anything about him, but he is a type—if you take men of the Shurtleff type and put them in the organizing field you will have strikes galore. Why? Because, as the delegate from the Silk Workers has said, they are misled, and they are misled for the purpose of creating the idea at headquarters that they are the whole cheese as organizers. Now, in case there should be men who will



go into the organizing field and teach these fairy tales, it is necessary to have a check on them, and that check is here in this amendment. It might be said that it is a roundabout way of going to get a strike legalized; it is not, for this simple reason: that there is no strike called but what the conditions have existed for some little time, and it is quite easy to present the facts in the case a few days before you propose to go out on strike, to the General Executive Board or to the Local Executive Board as the case may be. It is quite easy to do so. There was a local proposed to be organized in the cloak making industry in the city of Toronto under exceptional circumstances. I immediately wrote to the Secretary-Treasurer that if a charter was demanded to refuse it, and I stated my reasons in the letter, and he has it. I did not want to see the Industrial Workers of the World precipitated into a strike in that manner. I recognized that it would have been a losing strike and would have done an immense amount of injury to the industrial movement in the city of Toronto, and I therefore took it upon myself to write to him that if a charter was applied for, not to grant it at that time, and circumstances after corroborated me in that belief. It is absolutely necessary that we have a check or else we will have the condition of affairs that we have had previously. If you have a proper organizer in the field there is no doubt but what the wage working class will be organized correctly and will not come in with the impression that immediately they are organized they are to go out on strike, which is the idea fostered by the A. F. of L.; and it logically follows from the position which they take, which is simply a fair day's work for a fair day's pay. Our ultimate aim is not that, but while we know we will be precipitated ultimately into strikes, we must come together as intelligent men.

DEL. SHENKAN: I move that this whole matter be referred to the Constitution Committee for action.

THE CHAIRMAN: I do not hear any second.

DEL. RICHTER: I second the motion.

(Del. Cox took the chair.)

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: It has been regularly moved and seconded that this whole matter be referred to the Constitution Committee.

DEL. SHENKAN: I just want to state the reasons for referring it to the Constitution Committee.

DEL. AUGUSTINE: A point of information—

DEL. SHENKAN: I will give my reason. My reason for referring it to the Constitution Committee is this, that they can bring in a proper report and embody it in the constitution so that a recurrence of this character will be impossible in the future.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: You have heard the motion; are you ready for the question? (Question called for.)

DEL. SHENKAN: Unanimous consent.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: If there are no objections to unanimous action upon this it will be so declared.

DEL. MOSKOVITZ: I don't want to waste the time of the convention, but I don't think that the motion of Comrade Shenkan's should prevail, for it does not help us to any better resolution. Any committee that may report on this matter cannot bring us any better resolution than the committee has brought forward just now, and I think we ought to vote the motion of Comrade Shenkan down and receive the report and the original amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Then you object.

DEL. FITZGERALD: I do not agree, for the reason that the committee has heard all the argument, and they have got very much more to work on, and therefore I think that motion ought to prevail.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Do you demand a roll call?

DEL. MOSKOVITZ: No.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: If there are no objections, then, this will be declared unanimously carried. Hearing none, it is so ordered.

DEL. DE LEON: I ask that that be put in the hands of the chairman of the committee. I do not see the secretary present.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: All right, I will place it in the hands of the secretary of the committee.

DEL. FORBERG: I would like to say that there have been some matters referred to the committee this afternoon that we will probably have to make a report on, and we will probably report later.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: This completes the report of this committee at this time. What is your further pleasure?

DEL. RICHTER: I move that they be continued.

THE CHAIRMAN: Next in order is the Ritual Committee. Is that committee ready to report?

DEL. FISCHER: As chairman I will state that we have not met yet because we did not have the resolutions. The committee will report in due time.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The next then in order is the Organization Committee. Is that committee ready to report?

#### COMMITTEE ON ORGANIZATION.

DEL. PARKS: As chairman of the Organization Committee I rise to state that Bro. Petriella is the secretary of that committee. I will state that we have had two meetings. Mr. Petriella has made the minutes, and the minutes are unanimously agreed to so far as we have gone. It will be necessary for the committee to have another meeting. Several committees have referred parts of documents to us for us to consider, and if Bro. Petriella has the book and the minutes of the resolutions that we have acted upon we are ready to report.

DEL. PETRIELLA: We, your Committee on Organization, beg to submit the following partial report:

Acting on resolution No. 4—really a communication, not a resolution—from Local Union No. 365, Jamestown, which requested an organizer for the textile workers, and also a Swedish constitution, we recommend this matter to the incoming general administration.

On motion of Del. Moskovitz the report was taken up and considered seriatim.

The recommendation of the committee was unanimously concurred in.

DEL. PETRIELLA (continuing): Resolution No. 5, from Local 191, Brooklyn, N. Y., at first referred to the Ways and Means Committee, and secondly to the Constitution Committee, regarding the Organizer Shurtleff affair. We recommend that this organizer or any other organizer must strictly adhere to the class struggle according to the fundamental principles laid down in the Manifesto.

(Unanimously concurred in.)

DEL. PETRIELLA (continuing): Resolution 27, from Local 297, Newcastle, Pa., 224 of Montreal, Can., 198 of Toronto, Can., requesting organizers for the East Canadian field, referred to the incoming administration.

(Unanimously concurred in.)

(Report continued): Resolution 21, from Locals 161, 61, 284 and

387, requesting a Jewish national organizer, referred to the incoming general administration.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: What does that mean? Does that mean favorable recommendation?

DEL. PETRIELLA: Yes.

(Unanimously concurred in.)

(Report continued): Resolution No. 40, from Local 372, Patton, Pa., referred to Literature and Education Committee; being a resolution in which Swedish literature is asked for.

DEL. REID: That was the resolution where I asked the elimination of the word "Socialism" and the substitution of some other word, because "Socialism" smelled pretty badly to a certain religious type in our midst.

DEL. MARKLEY: Being somewhat acquainted with the element down there, I felt that I probably might give some information. Patton, Pa., is not the element that that would imply. There are as strong revolutionists there as there is in any part of the country.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Correct.

DEL. MARKLEY: They want somebody to go down there.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Bro. Markley, one moment, please.

DEL. AUGUSTINE: A point of order. That has not been reported.

DEL. FRENCH: A point of order. The communication refers to having been referred to the Committee on Literature and Education, and not having been properly acted upon, the matter of discussing it is not yet in order. I believe Del. Markley can discuss it when it is reported on by the Committee on Literature and Education.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: I believe your point is well taken, Del. French. This committee offers no recommendation, but refers it to another committee.

(Unanimously concurred in.)

(Report continued): Resolution No. 41, from St. Louis, Mo., requesting a German organizer for the 7th day of October, 1906, at a meeting to be held at the northeast corner of 8th street and Lafayette; we recommend that the convention take this matter up, and if it is possible, that a German organizer be sent there immediately.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: You have heard the recommendation in reference to this.

DEL. PARKS: A question of privilege. Is it understood that we recommend a general German organizer?

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: I understand it is a communication that was read in connection with the resolutions and requesting that a German organizer be sent there simply for one day for a meeting that is to be held there, an organization of cement workers that wants to come into the I. W. W. They ask for a speaker that can speak in German for this one day, the 7th of October.

It was moved to turn over the matter to Sec. Trautmann.

DEL. SCHWEINBURG: Shall we send a speaker from here or St. Louis? The comrades in St. Louis have several speakers there to expound the principles of the Industrial Workers of the World.

DEL. MOSKOVITZ: The committee considered this question and found that the time is so short that it wanted to bring this matter before the convention. We do not recommend a general organizer to be sent, making an expense of \$100 to get down there, but we understand that the general office may know some man near by that is suitable, and if such is the case, if our General Secretary knows of such a comrade that may fill the place, we request that a German organizer be

sent there for that particular purpose for that one time; the nearest man that can be found to be sent there, a German speaker.

DEL. RUGG: I move that the communication be referred to the General Secretary-Treasurer. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: It has been moved and seconded that the communication be referred to the Secretary-Treasurer. Are you ready for the question? (Question called for.)

(Chairman St. John resumed the chair.)

DEL. COX: I perhaps might shed some light on this in a few words. I will state that when this letter was read before the convention I took cognizance of it. We have a German speaker in St. Louis, and I immediately wrote a letter to him calling his attention to this request that was read here and asking him to look after it if the convention was not able to send some one. I refer to Joseph Scheidler, whom some of you remember. He was at last year's convention. He is a good speaker in German. He is not an orator, but he understands industrial unionism and can present it before a body of German people.

DEL. HAVER: A question of information. The Silk Workers thought we were going to form a department in this convention. I find now that we have not got the required membership. I would like to know if I have time enough to put in a resolution that will make some kind of provision in regard to an organizer being sent there.

DELEGATES: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: What is your pleasure in regard to this motion; that the report of the Committee on Organization in regard to sending a German organizer to St. Louis for October 7th be referred to the General Secretary-Treasurer?

(Unanimously concurred in.)

DEL. PETRIELLA (continuing report): Resolution 53, communication by Del. Lingenfelter recommending that a special assessment of 25 cents be submitted to a referendum vote of the Industrial Workers of the World. The second part of this communication deals with the salary and expense of organizers, and is referred to the Ways and Means Committee.

(No action taken.)

(Report continued): Resolution No. 58, from Local 158, Denver branch of Cigarmakers, referred to Grievance Committee.

(No action.)

Resolution No. 56, from Local 190, Brooklyn, N. Y., referred to Committee on Strikes and Lockouts.

(No action.)

(Report continued): Resolution No. 64, from Local 325, Tonopah, Nev., requesting that organizer be sent to that district; we recommend this communication to the incoming administration.

(Unanimously concurred in.)

(Report continued): Resolution No. 61, from H. Griffith, organizer for Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel and Tin Workers, Steubenville, Ohio, referring to the conditions among the metal workers in that locality; we refer this communication to the incoming general administration.

(Unanimously concurred in.)

(Report continued): Resolution No. 65, from S. J. Duffield, Ocean Park, Cal., asking aid for organizing the musicians' union; we referred this communication to the incoming general administration.

(Unanimously concurred in.)

(Report continued): Communication No. 67, from Local 328, London, Ontario, asking for an organizer returning from the Industrial

Workers of the World convention on his way home; we recommend that if there are volunteers they will report to the General Secretary.

(Unanimously concurred in.)

(Report continued): Resolution No. 68, a communication from the Forest City Baking Company of Cleveland, Ohio; we recommend that the communication be put on file for future reference.

(Unanimously concurred in.)

DEL. PETRIELLA: Your committee has nothing further to report for the present. We have several other communications on which we have not acted as yet.

### RESOLUTIONS.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Secretary has three resolutions to offer, and if there is no objection we will have him read them and refer them to the proper committees.

The Secretary then read the following resolutions, and they were referred as respectively noted:

#### No. I.

Chicago, Ill., Sept. 28, 1906.

To the Delegates and Comrades of the I. W. W. in convention assembled, greeting:

Whereas, In view of the fact that we find members of our class in all parts of the United States divided upon the industrial as well as the political field; and

Whereas, This division is affected by the enemies of our class interests, by clouding the mind with the cobwebs of ignorance, fanning the flames of racial prejudices; and

Whereas, We learn through the columns of the press that members of our class in the southern portion of the United States are ever locked in mortal combat, innocent lives are sacrificed, men, women and children thrust into prison, murdered, homes pillaged and destroyed; and

Whereas, We find that every branch of this government is being used to foster the above heinous crimes in order to satiate the greedy maw of the capitalist class; and

Whereas, The I. W. W., an embryonic structure of the Co-operative Commonwealth, is organized for the purpose of effecting a working class solidarity with the aim and object in view of destroying this damnable class condition which at present prevails; and

Whereas, In order to carry out this historic mission it is our duty to recognize that "an injury to one is an injury to all" of our class; and

Whereas, A portion of our class, namely, the Negroes of Atlanta, Ga., are the victims of the above mentioned crimes, and their blood is appealing to the representatives at this convention, and we should hearken to its cry; therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the representatives of the Industrial Workers of the World, go on record as denouncing such crimes as a blot on the garment of civilization, and that we give our moral support toward eliminating such wanton and atrocious acts; and be it further

Resolved, That these resolutions be spread upon the minutes of this convention and a copy forwarded to the capitalist as well as labor press and the President of the United States as well as Congress, with a view of serving notice upon the capitalist class that we, the Industrial Workers of the World, know our class interests, and are preparing not only to serve notice but enforce our rights as a working class, regardless of race, creed, sex or color.

Respectfully submitted,

DELEGATE R. T. SIMS.

THE CHAIRMAN: What is the pleasure of the convention?

DEL. FRENCH: I move to concur. (No second.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Referred to the Resolutions Committee.

#### No. J.

Whereas, The Arizona State Union No. 3 of the Department of Mining desires to be chartered as a Council of the I. W. W., and

Whereas, The constitution of the I. W. W. has no provision for the chartering of such organization, therefore be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Constitution is hereby instructed to formulate an amendment to the constitution to apply to the case of the Arizona State Union and similar organizations which may desire to be chartered.

ALBERT RYAN,  
Delegate, Dept. of Mining.

(Committee on Constitution.)

#### No. K.

Resolved, That an official copy of the stenographic report of the proceedings of the second annual convention of the I. W. W. be furnished to the Miners' Magazine, the Daily People and the Industrial Worker as soon as possible after the adjournment of this convention, for publication in the said journals.

THE CHAIRMAN: What is your pleasure in regard to this resolution?

It was moved and seconded to concur.

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been regularly moved and seconded that this resolution be concurred in. You have heard the motion; are you ready for the question? (Question.) The question has been called for.

DEL. DE LEON: If I understand, you are to send them simultaneously to the three papers. I sympathize with the purpose, but I want to call your attention to the fact that this report is to be sent after it has been edited. The stenographer will tell you that the stenographic report is not in a condition to go to the press when it comes out of the stenographer's hands. Now, if it is not edited by some one before it is sent to all the papers, the result of it is going to be that each paper is going to edit it, and you are going to have three stenographic reports—not materially different, but with changes and differences that there ought not to be in a stenographic report. So that I make a suggestion that it be handed to those papers as soon as it is edited by the editor of the Industrial Worker.

DEL. RYAN: I think it says "official report." I do not think any report is official until it has been edited and has the seal of the general administration. Doesn't it say "official"?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

DEL. RYAN: If it is an official copy, all right. I do not consider it official because Mr. McDermut makes it.

DEL. DE LEON: That is understood.

DEL. McMULLEN: What do you understand by being edited?

DEL. FRENCH: By the committee on style.

DEL. McMULLEN: You are following the mark quite closely. I do not understand that there is any necessity for editing. I presumed that this stenographer was to transcribe the notes and the same will be furnished to the papers there mentioned. Now, if it requires any editing, let us know who is going to do this editing.

DEL. RYAN: Surely, you ought to understand. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that my idea of editing the stenographer's notes is

simply this: that he is in duty bound to this convention not only to correct some grammatical phrases that have been used on this floor, but also, I believe, in justice to Del. McMullen even, to cut out several remarks that he has made. (Laughter.) Pardon me; I am in earnest. I do not think Del. McMullen would like to go on record before the entire working class of this country as having given vent to certain expressions. I do not think I, as a delegate to this convention, would approve of the record showing that Charles O. Sherman called, I think, the oldest, most venerable man in this assembly a coward. I don't.

DEL. McMULLEN: Who called him that?

DEL. RYAN: Charles O. Sherman, the ex-General President of the Industrial Workers of the World.

DEL. McMULLEN: Called whom?

DEL. RYAN: If he called him that or any name, I think the reporter should strike that out.

DEL. McMULLEN: If we want to do that we should instruct him.

DEL. RYAN: But I contend that this ought to be edited. When I say edited I do not mean that the statement of any delegate on this floor should be mutilated, but the ideas that he intended to convey should be couched at least in orderly language. Therefore I move for having this thing edited, and I believe it is the duty of the Secretary-Treasurer of the organization as well as the General Executive Board that will be elected to go through the whole thing, have it read, criticize it and see that it is an official transcript of the proceedings of this convention. That is my idea of an official report of the convention.

DEL. McMULLEN: Will you kindly allow that to be read again? I may want to make some remarks; I don't know.

(The resolution was again read.)

DEL. McMULLEN: That identical resolution, I want that to prevail. I haven't any objection to one solitary word in that resolution. I believe it is fair. I believed that was what we had the stenographic report for, so that men as they expressed themselves, the different expressions would represent the people who sent them here.

DEL. RYAN: Pardon me. Just a point of information. I would like to ask a question, and then I am done. May I ask a question?

DEL. McMULLEN: You may if you don't ask it in my time, Ryan. I don't care to be interrupted; it only takes two or three minutes out of my time.

DEL. RYAN: It is just a simple question.

DEL. McMULLEN: Then ask the question.

DEL. RYAN: All right. If Del. McMullen's contention is simply that he is willing to go on record as having stated here this forenoon that he is a numskull, I agree to the whole cheese. (Laughter.)

DEL. McMULLEN: I have not a particle of objection to one single word that McMullen has said on this floor appearing in that transcript.

DEL. RYAN: I am glad to have you say so.

DEL. McMULLEN: I don't take a particle of exception to anything I have said appearing, and I don't think any one else ought to take any exception.

DEL. RYAN: I don't. I sat there and enjoyed it.

DEL. McMULLEN: I don't know but what Del. Ryan may have said something that the Secretary-Treasurer of this organization might trim up in better shape, but he can trim nothing of mine. What I have said is my sentiments. I will stand by them. I want to quote men by exactly what they said here, not by what the Secretary-Treasurer might understand they said, not at all. Now, sir, that is what this is for; that is what the funds of this organization are used for, that

identically what is said here should go out. Now, that is what that resolution says. I am in favor of that resolution. I believe it is couched in a fair spirit. If a man don't want to be quoted as saying a think he need not say it. There is no need for him saying these things, and I deny the right of any stenographer of this organization, at this time, in the future or any old time, to edit my remarks. I am editing my sentiments here.

DEL. DE LEON: I am very glad that I brought up the matter, because it should be well understood that no paper will or should print ungrammatical language. By editing I do not mean that any word used should be expunged. That is not editing; that is called expurgating. I would be sorry if this stenographic report should omit that expression of Sherman when he called me a coward. I don't know why he didn't call me a green cheese, it would have done as well; it would have been equally absurd. I want that absurdity to go down. But when I speak of editing I use the language in the sense that is generally understood. No letter, no writing, no document should go to the press before it is fit for the press; because the proofreading becomes arduous. Compositors are in the habit of handling such very poor copy that each compositor considers himself a committee on style, and he thereupon goes ahead and corrects mistakes in grammar, and since those compositors are merely blacksmiths they put in a good many mistakes. Whenever idiom is to be printed it is marked "Follow copy closely." Now, we have not been talking here in idiom, and as Bro. Ryan stated, it is no disgrace to the delegates who did not have a better opportunity to learn English, that their grammar in many cases was not what it should be. Now, I ask, would it be fair to a delegate to present his language in the exact form used? It is to be edited and put in English. That does not imply that a single word that he used is going to be taken out, but his ungrammatical sentences have to be corrected. We do not want to make him look ridiculous. That is what editing means; and since I know that that report is to be sent to the Miners' Magazine, the Daily People and the Industrial Worker, unless your editor fulfilled his duty of editing it the sense in which I am using the term, we would have three different stenographic reports; not in essentials, but in details. The stenographic report should be identical down to the commas. Del. Ryan has called my attention to the fact that this speaks of this as the official report. By "public official report" anything is understood. I want to state that the stenographic report published by the Daily People last year was not published and I did not presume to publish it until I received word from the National Secretary-Treasurer. The stenographer sent a copy to him and a copy to me, and I never proceeded before the Secretary-Treasurer put his O. K. on it. And that is the only way to proceed in matters of this kind.

DEL. McMULLEN: I want to point out that the official proceedings of the last convention were edited by the Secretary-Treasurer, and so the caption said when it went out to the public. Everybody knew that they were edited by him. I talked with four delegates who were in attendance on this floor, and they said that remarks had been abridged under the guise of editorship. I want to say for the gentleman in charge of the Miners' Magazine, that he will print the proceedings as they are taken down here and sent to him, without any corrections, and that is just exactly what I want done in my own case and any other delegate's case here, so that the people we represent here will know what we meant, in our own language and our own way of saying it. Now, I know that the other side have said some things that they don't want to appear.

DEL. De Leon: No.



DEL. McMULLEN: Under the guise of somebody having the right to strike it out they will edit it, and out it goes. But they don't want to edit anything of mine. Now, sir, I have said what I want to say, and it is down there. I stand for what is down, and let it be there.

DEL. DE LEON: Mr. Chairman, I wish this to go on record. That statement that the National Secretary-Treasurer made the captions is a statement without foundation in truth. The captions were made by the stenographer. He it was who made each of those captions. There is no foundation in the charge that the Secretary-Treasurer made the captions. The captions came to me in typewritten style as the stenographer produced them.

DEL. SCHWEINBURG: I most emphatically protest against Bro. McMullen if he says this side has something to hide. Every word that was said on this floor can be printed, and I am willing to stand by every word that I say. But you can't get a stenographic report to the press without being edited. The stenographer, just taking down in shorthand every word that is said here, has no time to put everything out in the English language, to put in every comma or every iota or everything there. That must be done by the editor of the stenographic report. If McMullen don't know this, then certainly he has had very little to do with stenographic reports or with editing.

DEL. RYAN: Do you stand by what you said there?

DEL. McMULLEN: I will stand by what I said.

DEL. RYAN: That is all I want.

DEL. SIMS: Mr. Chairman, I don't understand this. At the same time I want to ask a question afterwards. I want to say that I am sorry to say some of these intellectuals who have rubbed their heads possibly on a college wall and acquired the grammatical phrases that they use, have an advantage here. We, the horny-handed sons of toil, know nothing about school houses and law books. What we know is what we pick up in the workshop and on the highways. There is no question but what nearly every one of these slaves in front of me don't look like college graduates, but look like slaves that never had a chance to go to school, and they cannot so construct their language that it will go down grammatically correct. It is absolutely impossible. I know I can't, and I know that I make any number of mistakes grammatically. What I have said on this floor I want absolutely quoted, but I want it grammatically correct. I want to be correctly quoted. I don't want to go out before the public as an ignoramus and held up to public ridicule. That is what the delegates want to be done, not to hold some poor wage slave up to ridicule because he can't handle the language as some one else handles it. I want to ask in conclusion, or before closing I would like to ask Delegate McMullen, who are these four that claimed that their remarks at the last convention were misquoted? I want to say, before you answer that question, that if any man made a remark here on this floor which was misquoted in the stenographic report, he certainly had an opportunity to have correction made of the misquotation, through the columns of the labor papers that are now circulating to every man, woman and child in the working class ranks and those most especially interested in the working class movement. I as a wage slave want to say that I don't want to go down on the stenographic report with the grammatical errors that I have made on this floor, but certainly I don't want to be misquoted. I want to be quoted exactly as I speak, but at the same time I want the corrections made. I would like, before sitting down, to ask Del. McMullen who were these four that said they were misquoted?

DEL. McMULLEN: Bro. President, it is a rather long story to start

this thing. Yet as you want to know the circumstances, it relates to this man that was expelled out of the Western Federation of Miners and that was expelled from the Montana Federation of Labor, Aleck Fairgrieve. Aleck Fairgrieve, if you will pick up the minutes of the last proceedings you will find that Aleck took quite a prominent part in a number of instances in the first convention, and I preferred the charges against Fairgrieve that expelled him from the Western Federation of Miners. Now, I have talked with Fairgrieve a number of times, and he just took down the minutes, and in going over those things he cited several instances of it. One in particular was then Moyer raised a point of order when he was putting in the report of the Committee on Constitution, and I was compelled to admit that the sense of the proposition did show that something had been cut out. I know Fairgrieve, and I know him intimately. I have worked and talked with him, and I am well acquainted with the gentleman—far better acquainted with him than any one here. I took up the report in regard to the matter he mentioned in regard to the constitution, and found myself where it looked as if there might have been some omissions. I do not charge intentional omissions. Now, I only want literally, gentlemen, just what has been taken there, just the same as a court record of testimony. If a man did say so and so, let it be printed.

DEL. DE LEON: I think there are two of the charges. He said four.

DEL. McMULLEN: It is not necessary to mention the four. I mentioned two.

DEL. DE LEON: You mentioned four.

DEL. McMULLEN: I mentioned it and gave you one man merely to give you an illustration.

DEL. PARKS: You stated that you preferred charges. In the statement of charges that you preferred against Fairgrieve, were they of your own personal knowledge.

A DELEGATE: A point of order.

DEL. DE LEON: I wish to ask the stenographer a question. I feel somewhat responsible for this wholesale charge, one-half of which has been marked out. There remains only one-half nominally, and one-half of that half limps. He said he corroborated the statement, and the report looked as if things were said that were left out. As Del. McMullen originally stated this, four had stated to him, and he corroborated it by saying that it looked as if something was left out. That was the first part of it. Any one who knows about stenographic work knows that something may have been left out in expurgation, so that there remains only the typographer's part. That is the only fact out of the alleged four. Now, the stenographer read carefully the book. I want to ask the stenographer whether he discovered anything left out from what he sent us of the minutes. Did he find any expurgation? That is what the charge implies. I desire the stenographer to answer.

THE STENOGRAPHER: I discovered nothing of that kind, and I read everything carefully. But Del. Fairgrieve, I remember, was a very fast speaker and very indistinct speaker, and I may have missed or misunderstood something of what he said.

DEL. McMULLEN: I desire to corroborate the gentleman's statement. Fairgrieve is a very rapid speaker.

DEL. DE LEON: We did not expurgate anything.

DEL. MOORE: As to the matter of changes in grammar, I do not care anything about that. I have never had any schooling. I never went further in the public schools than to learn my A B C, but I have been eighteen years in the printing business, and I believe I am the only compositor in the convention, and I want to say here that I don't

believe this man here taking the stenographic report is infallible; I don't believe it possible that this will go out without some errors. If a man is to be given the power to change a sentence used when it is ungrammatical, it would be utterly impossible but what he would change the sense of what some of the delegates said. Now, I hold that this man should be authorized to change words; for instance, a man that did not use good grammar and used "is" for "are" and "them" for "they," and all such words. I myself, and I believe Comrade McMullen and Comrade De Leon all want to go down in substance for every word they have uttered. I believe it is justice that every word that Comrade Sherman said goes down in substance just as he put it.

(Question called for.)

THE CHAIRMAN: The question has been called for. The motion is to adopt this resolution.

DEL. DE LEON: Read the resolution.

THE CHAIRMAN: "That an official copy of the stenographic report of the second annual convention of the I. W. W. be furnished to the Miners' Magazine, the Daily People and the Industrial Worker as soon as possible after the adjournment of this convention, for publication in the said journals."

DEL. SIMS: I move unanimous concurrence. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: If there is no objection to the granting of unanimous consent to the adoption of this resolution, the Chair will declare it so carried. The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

#### RESOLUTION.

The following resolution was then read by the Secretary and referred:

##### No. L.

Whereas, The cigar makers in Tampa, Florida, are now unorganized and

Whereas, The C. M. I. U. of A. have time and again scabbed on the Spanish cigar makers, and

Whereas, The Spanish cigar makers are known to be ready to become members of the I. W. W., therefore be it

Resolved, That the incoming General Executive Board send one Spanish and English-speaking organizer to Florida to organize the cigar makers.

A. LINGENFELTER.

(Committee on Organization.)

#### COMMITTEE ON LITERATURE AND EDUCATION.

The Committee on Literature and Education, through its chairman, Del. French, then made the following report:

DEL. FRENCH: I think a majority of the members of the Committee on Literature and Education are present, though Del. Dumas has not turned up and Del. Ahern withdrew from the committee. We think the report as far as it goes had better be submitted so that action can be taken upon it, to facilitate business, rather than wait till it is all finished; so that with the Chair's permission I will proceed to submit the report. It is a little long-winded:

We, the undersigned members of the Committee on Literature and Education, beg to submit the following recommendations to the second annual convention:

With regard to Resolution No. 25, submitted by S. Moskovitz, representing Locals 38, 61, 161 and 284, which reads as follows:

"Whereas, It is evident that industrial unionism is receiving the approval of the wage workers of all nationalities; and

"Whereas, The Jewish press has ignored this industrial union organization; therefore be it

"Resolved, That the convention take steps toward establishing a Jewish paper, and that until the establishment of such press we endorse and support financially and otherwise all such Jewish papers as have loyally supported and are supporting the revolutionary economic organization."

We recommend that the resolution as worded be not concurred in, and that all Jewish members of the I. W. W. be urged to consider it their duty to render all possible support to all Jewish papers which are consistently advocating the principles of the I. W. W., and we recommend that the incoming Executive Board give whatever encouragement it in its judgment deems necessary to such papers in order that they may continue to propagate the principles and aims of the I. W. W.

DEL. FRENCH: Shall we act on this seriatim?

It was moved and seconded to concur.

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been regularly moved and seconded that the convention concur in this report of the Committee on Education and Literature, this part of it with regard to the Jewish press.

A DELEGATE: Unanimous.

DEL. PETRIELLA: I am opposed to giving any endorsement or financial aid to any paper which is not issued directly from the national headquarters of the Industrial Workers of the World, especially to papers in languages which the people at the head of the organization cannot read. When I speak of a Jewish paper I intend to speak of an Italian, French and Polish paper. I have been editor of an Italian paper for about five years in this country. This year at the last convention of the Mining Department I had the paper that I was editor of endorsed by the Mining Department. That paper was owned by a private concern. The paper had been endorsed only a month before when right in the place where the paper was published about two years the men went on strike. I was not present at the time. Two of the men who went on strike called at the office of the paper and asked for some one on the editorial staff who would organize the men. They were disorganized. The proprietor of the paper not only did not send the man who had charge of the paper at that time in my absence to organize those men. If I understand right he did not care to have the men organized. You will then understand the reason why the paper that I had endorsed by the Mining Department did not take the side of the miners and did not say a word about it, and so with all the other papers. From experience I am against any paper which is privately owned. You might say the organization at this time cannot start the publication of a Jewish paper or an Italian paper or a French paper. That is all right. If you cannot start the publication of a paper you can print a leaflet, you can print a circular, no matter how large a circular, even if but the size of a postal card. Then you are sure that it is the sentiment, the thought of the organization, not the sentiment, the thought of any one else not connected with the organization. When we endorse and help a publication that is not owned by the organization we do nothing but foster pride to the detriment of our organization. So I won't concur in the report of the committee, and I hope that the organization will take into consideration this advice of mine, which as I said is the fruit of personal, however bitter, experience.

A DELEGATE: Read it again.

DEL. FRENCH: This is not for financial support.  
(Del. French again read the recommendation.)

DEL. RYAN: I am opposed to the proposition, and I will state my reasons very briefly. We are an economic organization of the working class. We can learn something from the political working class organizations. Past experience has shown anybody who has paid any attention to the matter that there can be nothing more injurious than to have working class political action and discussion by private owners of political papers such as—well, if you want the names, the Appeal to Reason, the Social Democratic Herald, the Volkszeitung and all the rest of that type. We have heard some expressions from some of the delegates on this floor since this convention has been in session. I don't see any sense in leaving it to individuals, I don't care who they are, who are going to take upon themselves the burden of explaining to the working class what a strictly economic organization should be. I say we should not allow the General Executive Board to endorse them in any way. We have got the Industrial Worker which is supposed to be the official expression of this organization. It is supposed to be under the control of the General Executive Board in the interest of the membership, and as such I think if there are any of our Jewish comrades and brothers who cannot get sufficient literature in the Jewish tongue I would like to have a paper published in their own tongue, issued serially and supported by the Industrial Workers of the World, but I will not vote for this convention to endorse privately owned papers of any kind, either on the economic or political field. (Applause.)

DEL. McMULLEN: What is the motion, Mr. Chairman?

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is to concur in the recommendation of the committee.

DEL. McMULLEN: I desire to be recorded no.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question? (Question called for.) Call the roll.

DEL. RYAN: We don't need any roll call, I guess. There is only one asking to be recorded as no.

A DELEGATE: Put me down too.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will have to call the roll.

The roll was partly called.

DEL. GOLDBERG: The importance of that question was not discussed at all. It is important to the Jewish men in the East.

A DELEGATE: How do you vote?

DEL. GOLDBERG: I vote yes.

The roll call was resumed, but not completed.

DEL. RICHTER: Mr. Chairman, I voted yes on the first vote, but I want to change to no. While I am in favor of the intention of the motion, yet its wording defeats its intent, and consequently I vote no.

The roll call was then finished.

DEL. VEAL: I want to be registered as voting yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Del. Veal desires to be recorded as voting yes.

DEL. SIMS: Since I have learned the nature of that vote—I didn't learn the nature of it before, and did not vote—I would like to record my vote yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Del. Simms desires to be recorded yes, three votes.

DEL. McCUE: Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether I am in order or not, but there is a matter here that I would like to call the attention of the convention to.

DEL. GOLDBERG: A question of information.

THE CHAIRMAN: Wait till the vote is announced.

The vote resulted: Total vote, 565; Yes, 25; No, 540.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is lost.

DEL. McCUE: Mr. Chairman—

DEL. DRESSLER: I move that we adjourn. (Seconded.)

DEL. DE LEON: I move that we adjourn now to meet next Monday morning at nine o'clock in this hall, or in the next one, whichever one is ready. (Seconded.)

DEL. ABBOTT: I move to amend that we meet tomorrow morning at nine o'clock—Sunday morning. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: A motion has been made to adjourn till Monday morning at nine o'clock. An amendment has been offered to adjourn till tomorrow morning at nine o'clock. The question is on the amendment. Are you ready for the question?

DEL. SHENKAN: I believe we should knock off one day to give the committees a chance to do some work.

DEL. PARKS: Mr. Chairman, as chairman of the Organization Committee I will say that we have got more matters to act upon than we have acted upon heretofore, and we will have to have some time to work, and if you do not adjourn over tomorrow we will have to work tonight.

THE CHAIRMAN: Then vote down the amendment; I don't care.

The amendment was put and lost. The convention then adjourned until Monday morning at nine o'clock.

#### MONDAY, OCT. 1, 1906.—MORNING SESSION.

Chairman St. John called the convention to order shortly after nine o'clock.

Sec. Edwards called the roll of members.

#### RESOLUTIONS.

The following resolutions were read and referred as noted below:

##### No. M.

I move you that the I. W. W. do not accept any advertisements to insert in their official journal from any capitalist firms whatsoever.

DELEGATE McCUE, Local 307.

(Ways and Means Committee.)

##### No. N.

Chicago, Oct. 1, 1906.

To the Delegates of the I. W. W. Convention:

We, the Silk Workers of Greater New York and vicinity, thinking we were to form a textile department at this convention, but not having the required membership represented by delegates at this convention, we would therefore like to have an organizer sent to New York and vicinity, one who understands something of the textile industry, there being a good field to work on in the silk industry alone. We therefore hope you will take this matter into consideration in order to keep said silk workers in the I. W. W. and to get new members. It will require a good man to make matters clear to them, on account of the general cleaning up made at this convention, so we hope this convention will take immediate action in this matter.

Respectfully submitted by Silk Workers' Industrial Union, Locals 190, 176, 336, 301.

FRED. W. HAVER, Delegate.

(Organization Committee.)

## No. O.

I move that the following clause be inserted in the constitution:  
 "No member of the Industrial Workers of the World shall be an officer  
 in a pure and simple union."

GEORGE S. HOLMES.

Seconded by Wm. E. McCabe.  
 (Committee on Constitution.)

## No. P.

I move that in Section 2 of Article III the words "and mixed locals"  
 be inserted after "Industrial Departments," to read as follows: "In-  
 dustrial Departments and mixed locals shall pay as general dues into the  
 treasury of the I. W. W. the rate of 8½ cents per month per member."

GEORGE S. HOLMES.

Seconded by William E. McCue.  
 (Committee on Constitution.)

## No. Q.

Colorado City Union No. 182,  
 Colorado City, Colo., June 20, 1906.

Ludwig Gunther,

Colorado Springs, Colo.

Comrade:

At our meeting of June 19, 1906, the following instructions were  
 adopted for you as our delegate to the coming convention of the In-  
 dustrial Workers of the World, viz.:

1. The constitution be amended to read "working people" instead of  
 "wage workers."
2. That each union be allowed to fix its own initiation fees and  
 monthly dues.
3. To retain Charles H. Moyer on the Executive Board.
4. To adopt a uniform wagon and harness card for teamsters.
5. That it be not necessary for a person to be on the floor of the con-  
 vention to be nominated for an office.

To all of which we ask you to use your best endeavor.

By order of the Union.

CHRIS. HANSEN, Secretary.

(Union Seal.)  
 (Committee on Constitution.)

## No. R.

Whereas, The verdict of the majority is more to be trusted than  
 the decision of a single man; and

Whereas, The majority must atone for all the mistakes, as well as  
 profit by all the wise deeds, of social administration, whether it be the  
 administration of the majority or not; and

Whereas, The mistakes of the majority are due to ignorance; and

Whereas, The suffering of the majority from its own mistakes is an  
 educating factor, while the sufferings entailed by the mistakes of an  
 irresponsible ruler tend to exasperate and not to educate; therefore  
 be it

Resolved, That, although the majority may rule clumsily and un-  
 wisely at first, all acts and decisions of the organizers and other offi-  
 cers of the I. W. W. which affect the general welfare shall be sub-  
 mitted to referendum vote, when it is called for, either of the whole  
 organization or of the department or local most concerned; and be it  
 further.

Resolved, That no officer of the I. W. W., either local or general, shall have power to appoint committees or other officers except in cases of emergency.

Fraternally submitted,

C. H. DUNCAN,  
Representing Local Union 222, Spokane.  
(Committee on Resolutions.)

No. S.

Resolved, That the constitution as it has been amended be subject to a referendum vote of the membership of the organization.

FRED. G. MOORE,  
T. PETRIELLA.

(Signed.)  
(Committee on Constitution.)

No. T.

Whereas, The benefit and insurance feature is deemed by many to be a necessary institution under capitalism; and

Whereas, It is the opinion of many that it is necessary to have such an attachment to labor organizations; therefore, be it

Resolved, That this convention appoint a standing committee to report to the next convention their findings and recommendation as to the best plan to be adopted to segregate the benefit and insurance feature from direct connection with the I. W. W.

WADE R. PARKS.

(Committee on Constitution.)

#### CREDENTIALS.

The Secretary read a letter addressed to the Credentials Committee from Local 103, Buffalo, N. Y., requesting that owing to the absence of Del. Hauk, Del. Tjeller be authorized to represent the local.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair is of the opinion that that communication is the same thing as a proxy.

DEL. McMULLEN: I move that the delegate be given a seat under the terms and conditions named. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: There is no question before the house of seating any delegate that I know of.

DEL. McMULLEN: It was agreed, I believe, that any local union sending a letter here setting forth their wishes to that effect, under the seal of the union, the same should be done. I am only offering a motion that he be given a vote according to the terms of that agreement.

(Motion unanimously concurred in.)

The Secretary read a letter from Local 215, Pittsburg, Pa., requesting that its vote be transferred to E. R. Markley. Signed and sealed.

Del. Holmes moved that Del. Markley be given the vote as requested. Seconded.

DEL. HENDRICKS: I would like to inquire if this is a transfer to a delegate of another organization represented in this convention. I would like to know whether that is a fact or not?

THE CHAIRMAN: If the Chair's memory is correct, the delegate representing this union left the convention and was recalled home, and this is a transfer of that vote. Any further remarks? Is there any objection to granting unanimous consent to the request?

DEL. HENDRICKS: I object to the delegate of any other organization representing another one as a delegate on this floor.



DEL. FOX: I don't see why the delegate should object to this. There are plenty of delegates on the floor now who were reported by the Credential Committee as entitled to carry the vote of their own or some part of the organization to which they belong and also one to which they do not belong.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any further remarks? (Question called for.) The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called as far as McMullen.

DEL. McMULLEN: On the principle involved in the matter it forces me to vote against this motion as I understand it. I have no objection to this man taking a seat any more than anybody else, but the general principle of the thing I have always thought bad, and I will go on record no.

The roll call was then completed. Total vote, 555; Yes, 221; No, 334.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is lost.

DEL. MOORE: Is there anything before the house?

THE CHAIRMAN: The report of the Committee on Education and Literature is before the house when the Secretary gets through there.

ALT. KIEFE: I would like to make a statement before ten o'clock. If there is nothing before the house I want to make a statement. I would like to protest for the delegates who voted for the amendment that said the political clause be stricken out of the Preamble. I notice in this morning's edition of the Daily People—

DEL. DE LEON: A point of order, that nothing that appears in any paper not owned by this organization is proper before this convention.

THE CHAIRMAN: The point of order is well taken.

ALT. KIEFE: I do this because the Daily People misrepresents us and calls us reactionists. They misrepresent the doing of this convention. That is all there is to it.

#### REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LITERATURE.

DEL. FRENCH: On the matter of Resolution No. 29, submitted by A. L. Smith, New Orleans Industrial Union 38, reading as follows:

"Be it resolved, That the official organ be published weekly; be it further.

Resolved, That the official journal and all journals of departments and subdivisions connected with the I. W. W. be subject to control by the General Executive Board."

We, the committee, recommend that this resolution as worded also be not concurred in, for the reason that we do not think it advisable at the present time to attempt the issuance of a weekly journal, because we consider that a weekly must of necessity take the character and feature of a newspaper, and while the possibilities of a well, attractively gotten up and comprehensive monthly or semi-monthly are as yet untried, we would recommend that the judgment of the Executive Board be relied on to develop the official organ in line with the spirit of the organization and the requirements of the situation. As to the second part of said resolution, we agree with the sense of that portion and recommend that the General Executive Board be authorized to collaborate with and establish supervision over the management of all journals of all departments or subdivisions or other component parts of the I. W. W. so as to insure the required uniformity of all official organs of this organization.

THE CHAIRMAN: What is the pleasure of the convention in regard to this report?

Del. Foote moved that the report be adopted. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: You have heard the motion; are you ready for the question? Are there any objections to granting unanimous consent to concurrence?

DEL. KLEESE: One moment. I desire the report to be read again. I couldn't hear it all, but what I could hear I disapprove of.

DEL. FRENCH: I thought I read it clearly enough. I will read it again.

The report was read the second time.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is to concur in the report of the committee.

DEL. McMULLEN: I desire to be recorded voting against that. I do not believe the General Executive Board of this organization has any right to supervise the miners' organization through the departmental organ in any sense. We don't concede that to any man.

DEL. McKINNON: I demand a roll call on that question to find out whether this convention is running the Miners' Magazine or not before we get through.

DEL. FRENCH: I might state the sense of the committee in putting this is this way. In the matter of the first part, just as we have stated there, we figured that there are great possibilities in the development of our official organ that may enable the organization to get out a first-class monthly, and that the other papers that will undoubtedly arise from the departments and subdivisions, etc., will take possibly more of the features that are required for general news. As to the other recommendations that we have made, we are in a position to put up a first-class monthly, and were they carried out they would make the monthly just the kind of an organ we should have. We did not believe we needed a weekly newspaper, but that this organization should use its efforts to build up a first-class monthly or semi-monthly. And on this other matter, believing that this organization is not formed of component strictly autonomous parts, that it is an organic whole, and that there should be as much uniformity as possible in the official organs that may be published by the component parts, it is well to have at least enough of supervision, or more than mere collaboration should be established so as to prevent the jumping off into an almost strictly autonomous attitude by the organ of any department or subdivision or local organization that may start an organ. That was the sense of the committee in putting this in that way.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Secretary will call the roll.

DEL. SIMS: What is the question you are going to call the roll on? Are you going to call the roll on whether you are going to adopt the resolution or not?

THE CHAIRMAN: As to whether we will adopt this report. The motion is to concur in the report of the committee.

The roll call was begun.

DEL. FORBERG: I want to explain my vote. Personally I am in favor of that motion, but my local instructed me to vote for a weekly, and therefore I will have to vote no.

The roll call was continued.

DEL. PARKS: Mr. Chairman, I want to say that this resolution traverses my opinion in some respects and in some respects I am in favor of it. It does not voice my sentiments in other respects, and therefore I cannot vote.

The calling of the roll was resumed.

DEL. SIMS: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say concerning my vote that I think this railroading of things is adopting a peculiar precedent. Now, this is a very vital question and we did not have any discussion

on it whatever. The convention practically did not get their ideas upon it as to the vitality of this proposition till just before submitting to the convention roll call. I think had the whole constitution been known it would have been different from what it is. The official organ of this organization has a great educational tendency, and when we get other organs in there switching off and inserting articles taken up concerning the Industrial Workers of the World to suit themselves I think it is a dangerous precedent to establish. We should certainly regulate our official organ, and hence I am going to vote yes even if I may not be suited.

The roll call was finished.

#### STATUS OF CHARLES O. SHERMAN.

CHARLES O. SHERMAN: Mr. Secretary, I would like to inquire why my name was not called.

THE SECRETARY: "Charles O. Sherman."

MR. SHERMAN: "No."

DEL. PLUMMER: If Sherman can vote can't Kirkpatrick and McCabe vote? I understood Sherman is not a delegate, or does he vote by virtue of his office? As we disposed of the President I do not see why you have a vote coming.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair is of opinion that the convention has decided that point; that the abolishment or abolition of the office of President deprived Bro. Sherman of any vote.

MR. SHERMAN: I would like to ask the Chair as to when this convention decided that Sherman is deprived of a vote.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair has given its decision.

MR. SHERMAN: I would like to have the minutes show that I protest in this matter. I am still President of the Industrial Workers of the World.

DEL. McMULLEN: I understand, then, that is the position of the President. Do I understand that is the official decision of the presiding officer of this convention?

THE CHAIRMAN: That is the presiding officer's understanding of the matter, yes.

DEL. McMULLEN: That is your understanding?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

DEL. McMULLEN: Now I want your decision.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is my decision in accordance with my understanding.

DEL. McMULLEN: That is what I want, the decision, and not the understanding.

SEC. EDWARDS: Wait—

DEL. McMULLEN: Now I want to get squarely on the record.

THE CHAIRMAN: Wait till the secretary has the vote counted.

DEL. McMULLEN: Do I understand you wish to announce the vote?

THE CHAIRMAN: No, I do not want to announce it. The secretary wants to get it down. They are delaying it.

DEL. McMULLEN: I wanted to know whether Edwards or the Chairman or you—

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you desire the floor before the vote is announced, on the protest, Del. McMullen?

DEL. McMULLEN: That is my desire.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have the floor, then.

DEL. McMULLEN: Mr. President, to show that this office of President, and this particular officer, was elected by a referendum vote, I

wish to establish that by the official proceedings of the Western Federation of Miners, to show you that the Western Federation of Miners as a department voted for him as President to be elected to that office until the same was abolished by a referendum vote. And that can be shown by the proceedings, as I believe you are well aware. That same report is signed by one delegate on this floor, Albert Ryan, wherein a copy of the constitution as well as the list of officers elected was submitted for a vote to be ratified, and it was so ratified and the official roster of the vote is also here showing clearly and conclusively that in order to change that law or change that officer or elect a successor, that he holds that office until that is done; that it must be submitted to a referendum. That is the reason why I protest against this action and I desire to be so recorded. I believe you have my name, Mr. Stenographer?

THE STENOGRAPHER: Yes.

DEL. McMULLEN: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: The secretary will announce the vote.

The roll call resulted: Total vote, 559; Yes, 198; No, 361.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is lost.

#### COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LITERATURE.

THE CHAIRMAN: The secretary of the Committee on Education and Literature has the floor if he has any further report to make.

DEL. FRENCH (For the committee): Resolution 30. Recognizing the spirit and substance of No. 30, submitted by Local 198, Toronto, through Del. James M. Reid, and worded in the following manner:

"Whereas, There are wage slaves of Macedonian descent in goodly numbers throughout Canada; and

Whereas, They are desirous of becoming acquainted with the principles of revolutionary industrial unionism; and

Whereas, Their ignorance of the English language precludes their receiving the principles of revolutionary industrial unionism; be it

Resolved, That the organization of the I. W. W. take steps as soon as possible to provide literature in the Macedonian language."

We recommend that it be concurred in.

DEL. McMULLEN: I would like to offer a motion that that be concurred in, and I would like to have the privilege of explaining my vote or why I offer it.

THE CHAIRMAN: What is your motion? To concur?

DEL. McMULLEN: To concur.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there a second to the motion?

The motion was seconded.

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been regularly moved and seconded that the recommendation of the committee in regard to the printing of literature in the Macedonian language be concurred in. Are you ready for the question? (Question called for.)

DEL. McMULLEN: Mr. Chairman, in my own community we find the use of various tongues. Almost every tongue spoken by the human family is spoken in Butte, Montana, and we have great difficulty in reaching that class of men who cannot understand English and certainly cannot speak it. And it puts us completely at the mercy of men who in a sense become conversant with some of the idioms of the language, though very few. Now, I want the convention not only to adopt this, but I hope that they will adopt it for other tongues that are generally spoken and thereby reach all. Let them know what industrial unionism means. I believe you will have done a great thing if you only do that one thing in this convention; that is, place your conception as I understand your conception of this organization so that the people of this earth can acquire an accurate knowledge of what it really is and what

its mission is—to bring the people together in one common united purpose of getting that which belongs to them. Of course, we do not want it understood that we are trying to preach the political doctrines of any sect of men. But the conception of the men created this organization, that is what you want to put in front of those people so that they will understand what the plan is. And I believe if you adopt this and consider this a stepping stone in that direction you will have done some good.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection to adopting this report?

DELEGATES: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: If none the Chair will order it ruled that unanimous consent has been given.

The report of the Committee on Education and Literature was continued as follows:

"Recommendations: For the more effective spreading of our principles, and as an aid to the work of the organizers we further recommend that the incoming Executive Board be instructed to have published a brief general leaflet setting forth the reasons for the position of the I. W. W. and to secure data with regard to the various industries to be organized, said data to be used in the compilation of departmental leaflets appertaining to the industries comprising each department.

"We also recommend that a series of industrial leaflets directly applying to each particular industry be gotten out for the same purpose and that the preparation of all such matters be entrusted only to competent writers and translators, and whenever possible to those with a direct knowledge of the industry or industries treated of."

On motion unanimously concurred in.

(Report continued): "We also recommend that an open forum be maintained in the columns of our official organ for the full and free discussion of all matters pertaining to the principles of industrial unionism."

It was moved to concur.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any objections to concurring? Are there any objections to the adopting of this recommendation of the committee?

A DELEGATE: None.

DEL. McMULLEN: There is no objection if it is understood. My conception might vary vastly from that of the paper or board controlling the organization. I understand and I want the record to show that the meaning of the committee which is reporting here is that the views of all men as they conceive them are to be printed just the same as what you might call the official organization's declaration of what it is.

DEL. FRENCH: No.

DEL. McMULLEN: Didn't I understand it so?

DEL. FRENCH: What we understand by an open forum is a correspondence column set apart in a portion of the paper wherein, supposing I have a different conception from what we mean by revolutionary industrial unionism and you conceive it to be some sort of evolutionary growth, you write your conception of it as a letter, and it will be edited as to grammar, but otherwise it goes in as you have written it. That is an open forum and the same way I mean.

DEL. McMULLEN: I am perfectly willing if that is the understanding.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection to granting unanimous consent to this recommendation of the committee? The Chair hears none and it is so ordered.

(Report continued): "We would suggest that there also be maintained in the columns of the 'Industrial Worker' an Educational Department which shall contain articles on sociology, economics and the sciences generally."

On motion of Del. Kinneally unanimously concurred in.

#### CHARACTER OF ORGANIZATIONS.

(Report continued): "For the same reasons we also recommend that the General Executive Board be instructed to send out as organizers only such men or women as are fully competent to clearly express the aims, principles and form of organization of the I. W. W."

DEL. FOOTE: I move to concur. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been regularly moved and seconded that this recommendation of the Committee on Education and Literature be adopted. You have heard the motion; are you ready for the question? (Question called for.)

DEL. McMULLEN: One word. Under the proposition just offered here, who is to be the officer that selects the organizers?

DEL. FRENCH: It is presumed to be the General Executive Board. It is not segregated. We say the general officers are instructed to send them.

DEL. McMULLEN: I see you do. But the old law as I understand makes it the duty of the president.

DEL. FRENCH: But the president no longer exists. We say the general officers, and if the President exists he is one of the general officers.

DEL. McMULLEN: This ought to be the specific duty of one officer. I want to find out who it is so that I can find out in some case what kind of qualifications these men and women will have and who they are, because you are dealing direct with them.

DEL. FRENCH: I will read it again. "We also recommend that the General Executive Board be instructed to send out only such men or women as are fully competent to clearly express the aims, principles and form of organization of the I. W. W."

DEL. McMULLEN: Sure, that is just what I say—

DEL. FRENCH: We say that only such men and women shall be sent out and employed, without saying who sends them out. But we understand this organization has already voted that it shall have no President in the future, and it is up to the convention to decide who shall send out the organizers. We are not the Committee on Constitution. We are simply recommending that none but competent organizers be sent out as a matter of education to those that we shall reach.

DEL. McMULLEN: Well, with the explanation made by the committee I am not yet clear, because as the old law read it was the duty of the President and he could be held responsible, and I have some conception as to what is responsibility. But under this general specification it is the duty of the general officers. Now, there may be, as there is at the present time, a wrangle between the general officers, with the result that we would have no organizers. Now, I want a law that specifically sets forth that it is somebody's duty to do this and that they will do it and be responsible for doing it. If you want to make it a majority of the board of directors or whatever you term them, make it so.

DEL. FRENCH: We are not the Committee on Constitution.

DEL. McMULLEN: You are making a proposition to do a certain thing. I am opposing it for these reasons. It is general and it is nobody's doing and nobody's business. Unless you make a law that particularly specifies that someone will put it in effect it will never be put in effect and your law is dead.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any further remarks?

DEL. FOX: I would think, as the committee has reported or stated on the floor, that that is the function of the Constitution Committee to report upon what board or what officers shall have control of the organizers. I think it very bad policy to put the control of the organizers into the hands of one man. It should be in the control of the Executive Board that probably will be put there, but it is not the function of this Committee on Education and Literature to say by whom those organizers shall be appointed. They only bring in the resolution with an opinion upon a statement that this convention should endorse a proposition that only competent organizers should be sent forth.

DEL. McMULLEN: I would like to ask the brother if in his judgment, during the past year, which is really the life of the organization, there were any mistakes made in the selection of organizers.

DEL. FOX: A whole lot of them. A whole lot of worthless organizers were in the field.

DEL. McMULLEN: Is that so?

DEL. FOX: Yes.

DEL. McMULLEN: Then the president was completely and fully justified, in your judgment, when he found out they were, as you describe them, no good, in removing them.

DEL. FOX: He may not have removed the incompetent ones. He kept Shurtleff in the field, and himself, who was the most incompetent of all.

DEL. McMULLEN: He himself was the most incompetent?

DEL. FOX: Yes.

DEL. MAHONEY: I would take it that the appointment of organizers by the President last year was referred to the General Executive Board.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is not the question. The appointment of organizers for the last year has nothing to do with the question before the house, and every delegate who has spoken along that line was out of order. I hope the delegates here will speak to the motion and confine themselves strictly so as to facilitate the business of this convention. I don't want to be continually calling the members down. They have just as much interest in getting through as I have.

DEL. FRENCH: I am of the opinion that this committee made this about as near right as they could get it. While some, Bro. McMullen for instance, want to quibble over the expression "general officers," my opinion is that the only reason they talk in that way is to kill time, that is all. As to the general officers, the Constitution Committee will bring in undoubtedly a recommendation that will settle that.

DEL. McMULLEN: I rise to a question of personal privilege. I am not going to be accused here of an ulterior purpose when I oppose or approve, which I have done, parts of this report. I was not accused of doing anything wrong when I approved of it. I object to a man rising and accusing me of an ulterior purpose and of wasting the time of this convention, when I have not wasted any particle of it, and the records will prove that I have not made a dilatory motion, and I do not intend to do so. Now, I object most emphatically to any man accusing me of an ulterior purpose. I act gentlemanly and courteously, and I desire like treatment.

DEL. FOX: I want to reply to what he said.

DEL. DUNCAN: To facilitate matters I move you that this part of the report be amended so as to read that the General Executive Board shall appoint organizers.

Seconded by Del. Fischer.

DEL. FOX: I want to say that the gentleman is here with dilatory tactics and I can prove it.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is not the point before the house.

DEL. FOX: He won't give his time on the Auditing Committee. He refuses to serve on the Auditing Committee.

DEL. McMULLEN: I deny that. I appeared twice on the Auditing Committee, to serve. Twice I appeared there.

DEL. FOX: You refused to serve.

DEL. FRENCH: Do you want this as amended?

THE CHAIRMAN: I don't know what is amended.

DEL. FRENCH: Do you want this "General Executive Board" instead of "general officers?"

DEL. DUNCAN: I would say "General Executive Board" instead of "general officers." Do you accept that going in there, Johnson?

DEL. JOHNSON: Yes, I accept it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Then read it as amended.

DEL. FRENCH (reading): "We also recommend that the General Executive Board be instructed to send out as organizers only such men and women as are fully competent to clearly express the aims, principles and form of organization of the I. W. W."

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection to granting unanimous consent to the adoption of this resolution?

DEL. MOORE: I do not care whether it is a General Executive Board which is composed of five or seven members or whether it is a President that sends out organizers to teach industrial unionism. In either case it is put into the hands of a few, one or a few. I do not believe that any General Executive Board should have any such power. I believe that the locals, the combined locals of this organization, should have as much right to nominate organizers as they should to vote for a couple of officers that are put up. I contend that to put the power of appointing organizers into the hands of the General Executive Board is imitating what Samuel Gompers has right now. Samuel Gompers in the American Federation of Labor perpetuates himself because he has the power to appoint organizers to teach the principles of craft unionism, and if you give to a General Executive Board the power to select without the rank and file having anything to say about who the organizers shall be, it cannot be the expression of the rank and file.

DEL. FOX: A point of order. It is not a question of who shall appoint the organizers, but whether or not you shall have competent ones. That is the only thing, and it is not a question who shall appoint them.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair will state that your point of order is well taken.

DEL. PARKS: I rise to a point of order. He is talking on the appointment.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Parks, let me suggest that there is no necessity of taking up time with a point of order.

DEL. PARKS: My point of order is that this does not exclude local unions or departments from electing organizers if they think they are competent.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection to unanimous consent being given this motion to concur in the report of the Committee on Education and Literature in regard to organizers?

A DELEGATE: No.

DEL. McMULLEN: As amended.

THE CHAIRMAN: To read "The General Executive Board."

DEL. McMULLEN: All right.



THE CHAIRMAN: It is so ordered.

DEL. FRENCH (continuing report): "Also that the various bodies connected with the I. W. W. be advised and urged to maintain at their respective headquarters a supply of working class literature for the furtherance of education among the membership."

On motion unanimously concurred in.

DEL. FRENCH (continuing report): "Finally, we recommend that the General Executive Board put into operation as soon as found feasible—that may be this year or ten years from now—that portion of the plan suggested by a resolution at the last convention by M. P. Haggerty of the Butte Milling and Smeltermen, which provided for the establishment of a lecture bureau and sending out traveling lecturers who shall fully explain the principles and final aims of industrial unionism. It does not embody the financial arrangement implied in it to carry out the resolution. It is simply that we suggest the putting in operation such a plan with regard to lecturers."

On motion the recommendation was unanimously concurred in.

DEL. FRENCH: Since the completion of that report additional resolutions Nos. 16 and 17 have been referred to us by the Committee on Constitution. The first we are not in favor of concurring in. The second we recommend to be concurred in, which is:

"Whereas, The membership of the organization should be kept posted on what goes on in the organization and in the labor world at large; and,

"Whereas, Some education is necessary for the qualifying of the membership in accomplishing the aims of the organization, namely, taking and holding the instruments and products of our toil; therefore, be it

"Resolved, That every local shall give to every member on initiation one year's subscription to the official organ, the Industrial Worker."

We recommend that it be concurred in.

It was moved to concur. Seconded.

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been regularly moved and seconded that the report of the Committee on Education and Literature in this matter be concurred in. You have heard the motion; are there any objections to granting unanimous consent?

DEL. RIORDAN: Yes, I object. I think that if the members of this organization want to receive the "Industrial Worker," the official organ of this organization, they should be willing to pay for it. If I understand the resolution right, each member of the organization is proposed to be given a subscription free.

DEL. FRENCH: That fifty cents of his initiation fee goes toward a subscription to the "Industrial Worker." That is the sense of it.

DEL. RIORDAN: Then I have no objection.

DEL. PETRIELLA: If fifty cents of the initiation fee will go for the subscription to the "Industrial Worker," will this "Industrial Worker" be given to members of the organization who cannot read English? What will they do with it? I ask that question.

DEL. FRENCH: If a man can't read English he can't read the "Industrial Worker"; that is a sure thing. That portion of it reads, "Every local shall give to every member on initiation one year's subscription to the official organ, the 'Industrial Worker.'"

DEL. PETRIELLA: Why shall that free subscription be given to each member of the organization who does not read English? For instance, in my organization 50 per cent of the men don't read English. Do you want them to subscribe for the "Industrial Worker?" What for?

DEL. McMULLEN: Does the committee's report make provision for putting literature before this section of the Industrial Workers in any other form?

DEL. FRENCH: Not yet. The next resolution will. Perhaps it will be well to read both, and you can read one by the light of the other. Resolution 17 says:

"Whereas, A labor union journal should give definite information as to the progress of the organization and the happenings in the different locals, the movements and plans of the employers, the treacheries of the pure and simple misleaders, the technical and mechanical improvements in the various trades, and other facts of interest to the membership; and,

"Whereas, Such journal should also contain articles on scientific working class economics in order to prepare the membership for their final and speedy emancipation from wage slavery; therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the editorial management of the 'Industrial Worker' be instructed to embody some of the above classes of matter in the columns of that paper, thus making it a real educational medium; and,

"Whereas, The membership of the I. W. W. is composed of workers speaking different languages; and,

"Whereas, Every man can best express his own ideas in his own language; therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the management of the 'Industrial Worker' be instructed to set aside a few pages for correspondence in different languages."

DEL. PETRIELLA: For educating such members? That will do for the members who speak English, but do you think those editorials will educate those who do not speak English? Will you educate those with the correspondence?

DEL. FRENCH: We have provided for leaflets in other languages to reach those that the "Industrial Worker" cannot reach.

DEL. PETRIELLA: You should devote more than a whole page. You should translate the whole journal into the other language for a certain proportion of members in the organization. I think those men have a right to be educated like the others, but as a matter of fact you speak of brotherhood and their equality, but those members of the local you do not want to do anything for them.

A DELEGATE: What is before the house, Mr. Chairman?

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion before the house is to concur in the resolution of the committee.

DEL. McINTOSH: I would like to ask Bro. Petriella a question, if you can answer it. You speak of men in your local that were not able to read English. We know that is true. Well, now, is it not true that most of them are family men and have children?

DEL. PETRIELLA: Yes.

DEL. McINTOSH: Is it not true that some of the members of the families can read English, and by that means they might be able to read and translate it to the parents or interpret it to the parents?

DEL. PETRIELLA: I would like to answer the brother that 90 per cent of the wage workers, at least those who were born in the same country where I was, have no families. Those who have families in most cases are small business men and are those who have been settled for a certain while in this country. They are no more wage slaves, they are exploiters, bourgeois just like the others, but the 90 per cent of the others are wage slaves who have no families; no matter if they have been in this country five, ten or fifteen years, they have no families; so that you know they will have nobody to read to them. A man has got to have something not only which can be

translated but something in the language in which he has been educated to think. The languages differ not only in words, but two men of different nationalities who are educated in different languages think in a different way, and the child, the boy who can read to his father an English page will not be able to convey the whole meaning of that page to his father. He has got to give him something in the language in which he has been used to think.

DEL. COX: A point of information. Let me ask if that question pertains to local unions.

DEL. FRENCH: As the local is the unit of the organization it covers the whole ground.

DEL. COX: Wouldn't it be just as well to leave it optional with the local whether they want to take that paper or not? Thereby the Italian people or any other nationality that didn't want it wouldn't have to take it. It is utterly impossible at the present time to print the "Industrial Worker" in every language in the universe. Therefore at the present time it should be optional with the local unions whether they wanted to sacrifice the fifty cents for the "Industrial Worker" or wanted to keep it in their treasury.

DEL. FRENCH: The committee desires to have it accepted in this manner, the last paragraph to read:

"Resolved, That every local be urged to give to every member on initiation one year's membership subscription to the official organ, the 'Industrial Worker.'"

That leaves it optional for an English-speaking local to give the "Industrial Worker" to its membership. Of course others can get their knowledge in the Jewish or Italian or some other language.

DEL. COX: I move that we concur in the amendment.

Seconded and unanimously carried.

DEL. FRENCH (continuing report): It seems that the only hitch in this is the final paragraph, which states that the management of the "Industrial Worker" are instructed to set aside a few pages for correspondence in different languages. Now, the framers of the resolution, and ourselves, for that matter, on the committee, did not see that point so closely as we do now when brought to our attention, that the correspondence column may be maintained in the different languages, but it would need an editor in each of those languages to edit that correspondence, as well as trouble in getting it set up. If we have got half a dozen letters in the Slav tongue it would be a pretty hard job for Comrade Edwards or anybody else to edit the letters, so there is room for somebody to make an amendment on that who knows more about it than we do.

DEL. FISCHER: I move you that we take this matter up seriatim. There are two resolutions, one relating to the "Industrial Worker" and the other relating to the correspondence column in different languages.

THE CHAIRMAN: We are taking them up seriatim.

DEL. DE LEON: I move that this be referred back to the Committee on Education and Literature.

Seconded and unanimously carried.

DEL. FRENCH: That is all we have to report at this time.

#### COMMITTEE ON RESOLUTIONS.

The Committee on Resolutions, through Sec. Ryan, submitted the following report.

DEL. RYAN: Mr. Chairman, this is all the business of the Committee on Resolutions that was referred to the committee previous to adjournment last Saturday:

## SOUTHERN OUTRAGES.

Chicago, Sept. 30, 1906.

To the Second Annual Convention of the Industrial Workers of the World.

Fellow Workers:

We hereby recommend that resolutions I and 46, which are attached hereto, be concurred in by the convention.

MAX HENDRICKS,

Chairman.

PAUL AUGUSTINE.

A. LINGENFELTER.

ALBERT RYAN.

## RESOLUTION I.

Chicago, Ill., Sept. 28, 1906.

To the Delegates and Comrades of the I. W. W. in Convention Assembled.

Greeting:

Whereas, in view of the fact that we find members of our class in all parts of the United States divided upon the industrial as well as the political field; and,

Whereas, this division is affected by the enemies of our class interests by clouding the minds with cobwebs and fanning the flames of racial prejudices; and,

Whereas, we find through the columns of the press that most of our class in the southern portion of the United States are ever locked in mortal combat, and innocent lives are sacrificed, men, women and children thrown in prison, murdered, and their homes pillaged and destroyed; and,

Whereas, we find that every branch of this government is being used to foster the above heinous crimes in order to satiate the greedy maw of the capitalist class; and,

Whereas, the I. W. W., the embryonic structure of the co-operative commonwealth, is organized for the purpose of effecting working class solidarity with the aim and object in view of destroying this damnable class condition which at present prevails; and,

Whereas, in order to carry out this historic mission it is our duty to recognize that "An injury to one is an injury to all" of our class; and,

Whereas, a portion of our class, namely, the negroes of Atlanta, Ga., are the victims of the above mentioned crimes and their blood is appealing to the representatives at this convention, and we should hearken to its cry; therefore, be it

Resolved, that we, the representatives of the Industrial Workers of the World, go on record as denouncing such crimes as a blot on the garment of civilization, and that we give our moral support toward eliminating such wanton and atrocious acts. And be it further

Resolved, that these resolutions be spread on the minutes of this convention, and a copy of these resolutions forwarded to the capitalist as well as the labor press and the President of the United States, as well as the Congress, with a view of serving notice upon the capitalist class that we, the Industrial Workers of the World, know our class interests and are prepared not only to serve notice, but to enforce our rights as a working class, regardless of race, creed, sex or color.

Respectfully submitted,

DELEGATE R. T. SIMS.

On motion the resolution was unanimously concurred in.

**RESOLUTION 46.**  
**A. F. of L. IN CALIFORNIA:**

L. U. 12, Los Angeles, Cal., Sept. 17, 1906.

Dear Comrade Holmes:

I am instructed by Local 12 to forward you a copy of this resolution passed at last regular meeting, Sept. 14:

Whereas; There exists today an open conflict between the capitalist class, aided and abetted by the Allied Printing Trades Council of Tonopah and Goldfield mining districts and the A. F. of L. in general upon one side and the I. W. W. backed by and assisted by the W. F. M., the Mining Department of the I. W. W. of the above mentioned districts; therefore, be it

Resolved, That Local 12 of Los Angeles in regular meeting assembled heartily endorses the actions of the I. W. W. and the W. F. M. in the above mentioned conflict, and that we deplore the existence of such an organization that claims to uphold the interests of labor and whose members are taught and forced to scab upon their fellow workers, as was done by the A. F. of L. in Goldfield against the poor struggling newsboys who sell the boycotted sheet by the name of the Tonopah Sun, and that capitalist and unclass-conscious organization, the A. F. of L., did associate and join hands with the gangs of hired thugs, assassins and would-be gun men of the capitalists in their efforts to intimidate and bluff the I. W. W. membership; and be it further

Resolved, That we, Local 12 of Los Angeles, do hereby offer all moral and financial support within our power, and that copies of these resolutions be forwarded to our delegate in Chicago, the I. W. W. paper and Miners' Magazine for publication, and the same be spread upon the records of this meeting.

MIKE BRADY, Secy.

(Seal of Union.)

Your committee recommends that the convention concur in the sentiment expressed in the resolution.

On motion the recommendation was unanimously concurred in.

**MOYER-HAYWOOD, AND GENERAL STRIKE.**

DEL. RYAN (continuing report): Resolution 22, by Teofilo Petriella: "Resolved, That it is the sense of this convention that in the event of a new delay in the trial of our brothers, Moyer, Haywood and Pettibone, or in the event of an unjust sentence in their case the national headquarters of the I. W. W. shall immediately proceed to call a general strike and use every possible means and all the funds at its command in order to warrant the working class to resist and overcome the violence of the masters." The committee recommends that this be not concurred in. The committee is prepared to state its reasons.

It was moved and seconded that the report of the committee be adopted.

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been regularly moved and seconded that the report of the committee be adopted. You have heard the motion; are you ready for the question?

DEL. PETRIELLA: Mr. Chairman, that resolution is signed by me, but it is the expression of a few more delegates who sit on this floor and who think as I do. We think that in dealing with the Moyer-Haywood and Pettibone affair this organization has acted against the declaration of our principles as embodied in the Preamble of our constitution. This organization has acted as most meek, law-abiding

citizens, while I claim that we are not law-abiding citizens. The very fact that we are organized for the purpose of taking from our masters the product of our labor means that we rebel against them. Now, then, several months ago several brothers of ours were kidnaped and were locked up. What did we do for them? We raised a defense fund, which practically means we fleeced our already skinned fellow workers to make more fat for the lawyers, the very people who uphold that system which we are organized to fight; and besides that defense fund we started to protest. What have you got out of the protest? Nothing at all. It was foolish to expect anything. We organized on economic lines because we believe that economic conditions are the basis of social conditions, and therefore they are part of the state, the courts, the police, the militia, etc. Now, if we admit this economic determinism, why do we appeal to the courts of the State of Idaho? Aren't they the courts of our masters? And do you expect the masters, the corporations, to be fair to us? If you could only for one moment hope or expect the masters to be fair to us, then it would not be necessary at all for us to organize, because they would grant to us what is due to us. But they won't. And so I think that whatever you have done has not accomplished anything and will never accomplish anything. We have got to change our policy. We know that in the last few days on the floor of this convention a good many delegates have called themselves revolutionists. I ask you, what do we mean by being revolutionists, by advocating a revolution? What is a revolution? It is a revolution to substitute our will for the will of those who rule us today. The French revolution happened not in those days or years that the historians tell us it happened, but I think the French revolution happened on the sixth day of October, when the people forced their king to return to Paris. It was a revolution when they substituted the will of the people for the will of the king. So we will have a revolution when our will, when our mind, when our thought shall be substituted for those of the masters, and I conclude that there is no other means to accomplish that except the general strike. You might not agree with the general strike for your organization, but if you do not believe in that because you think that at this moment from the smallness of our organization it is not practicable, that it is not feasible, then you should agree with me that we should resort to other means. I think that if instead of raising that defense fund, if instead of protesting we had got 25,000 men to go into Idaho to kidnap Governor Gooding and Judge Smith and bring them and keep them as hostages for the death of our brothers, those brothers would have been given back to us; otherwise we would not have given the hostages up. But we have done nothing of the kind. We are law-abiding citizens. After Aloyer is gone there will be somebody else to head this organization unless this organization does what the American Federation of Labor is doing, I mean uphold the capitalist system. But if we resort to the general strike, a strike in which we call out not only the members of our organization, but all those who are not in our organization but who feel the pressure of the masters—if they see that there is a rising up from below that is going to swallow them up—we will get those people. And, besides, we will educate the proletariat to a fight which sooner or later has got to come. A good many of you know me as a socialist. Well, I am a socialist to a certain extent, but I do not belong to that kind of socialists who think that dropping a piece of paper in the ballot box will give us liberty; I believe that means that you are giving a dose of chloroform to the proletariat, with the protests and with the raising of funds. I think we have got to educate them to go on strike

and take—you may dislike the words, but you have got to come to that—by violence what is extorted from us by violence. A good many of you on the floor of this convention claim to be socialists, claim to be disciples of Marx. Well, don't you remember what Marx said in answer to Proudhon in 1847, concluding with the words of George Sand, the words with which I close now, that it is no use to resort to any other means because a bloody fight will be irresistibly forced upon us.

DEL. HESLEWOOD: I rise to a point of order. We are working under the rules.

DEL. PETRIELLA: Under the rules relating to resolutions I am presenting the resolution, and I am entitled to ten minutes, and I have only spoken eight minutes.

DEL. HESLEWOOD: But we are getting hard up for time and we would like to get along. Go ahead.

DEL. PETRIELLA: Either there is action or there is nothing.

DEL. PARKS: Mr. Chairman, now, I am not in favor of concurrence in this resolution. If the resolution had been worded that we would instruct our general officers to organize for a general strike for the purpose of carrying out the ultimate aims and objects of this organization when we would decide that we were ready to do it and going to do it, then I might be in favor of it. Why have they got Moyer, Haywood and Pettibone in jail? Simply because it is a move to head off the purpose which these organizers of labor have in view. Now, if we will show that we in convention assembled are able to go on and carry the completion and fruition all of the purposes of Moyer, Haywood and Pettibone, then the capitalist class can see that it will be absolutely useless for them to sacrifice our brothers upon the capitalist cross. William D. Haywood has well expressed the spirit that should control in our deliberations when he wrote from his cell in the penitentiary that there are many Haywoods. (Applause.) Let us give the capitalists to understand that the labor movement will not go down if they do sacrifice a few of our comrades and brothers. Let us, as has been expressed and counseled in the columns of the Daily People, let us line up and exhaust every legal method that is available for us to save our brothers and let us go on serving the interests of the working class and the working class movement to the end that we may organize, that we will be prepared, as William D. Haywood expressed it last year, to strike, to take and hold these great industries when the capitalist class proposes to carry out that disintegrating program which, as I referred to, was voiced and expressed by Theodore Roosevelt in his little book called "American Ideals," where he said that a country that should elect as president such a man as Altgeld of Illinois or Governor Waite of Colorado would go to pieces within a year, and not only go to pieces within a year, but he said it ought to go to pieces and should go to pieces. We are organizing for that day when that capitalistic disintegrating program is inaugurated by the opposition, when we are prepared for a better and a higher system of society, prepared for an administrative democracy.

DEL. RYAN: A point of order, that the delegate is not talking to the question.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is the opinion of the Chair. The Chair will rule that the point of order is well taken, and you are not discussing this.

DEL. PARKS: All right. Now, I am opposed to the spirit and purpose of this resolution. We ought not to have any strike unless we can deliver the goods. There is a difference between riot and

revolution. There is a difference between commercial intrigue and revolution. Mr. Gompers yesterday in his speech used the word "revolution" in the sense of commercial intrigue and spoke of what he called the revolution in Cuba. I want to say that there is no word in the vocabulary that is being more abused today than "revolution."

By request the resolution of Del. Petriella was read again.

DEL. FISCHER: The proposition of a general strike must include a prospect of success. The question for us to decide is this: Are we in a position to declare a strike or not? You have heard the report of the General Secretary and President that the membership of the I. W. W. is 62,000 members. What can we do with 62,000 members distributed over the whole country in such an affair? You make yourselves ridiculous when you believe that these 62,000 men can turn the tide in a general strike. I, from my way of reasoning, cannot see how you can accomplish anything like that, and it will do us more harm than good. For that reason I am in favor of concurring in the report of the committee.

DEL. SHENKAN: I wish to go on record as being opposed to a general strike. for this reason: As already stated by Del. Fischer, and for the further reason that even if we were strong enough to declare a general strike, if we were numerically strong enough to declare a general strike, we would be strong enough to declare a general lock-out too of the capitalist class. That is the fundamental aim of this organization. That is all I have to say.

DEL. DUNCAN: I do not want to go on record as against the general strike. I am just as much in favor of a general strike under the right conditions as Bro. Petriella or Bro. Parks or anyone else here. But for us to consider any such proposition as that with our membership as we have it here and the conditions around us, such as they exist around us, in the capitalist state of North America, is a rank absurdity. We ought not to consider a gigantic proposition like a general strike until we have something to do it with. And though I am in favor of getting our brothers out of Idaho jail just as soon as possible, we ought to go about it in some reasonable way. If you undertake to call a general strike it will hold our organization up to ridicule and furnish excuses for the incarceration of others and the accusation of our brothers in a great many respects in which they have not been accused as yet. I want to ask the reading of the committee's recommendation to see whether they recommend to concur in that resolution or not.

DEL. RYAN: "We, the Committee on Resolutions, hereby return Resolutions 22 and 44 (22 is the one under consideration), and the committee recommend that the same be not concurred in."

DEL. PARKS: A question of personal privilege. I wish to have it understood that I am in favor of the recommendation of the committee. I don't know whether I talked to the motion or not.

DEL. HAVER: I wish to go down on record to shut off this debate on the general strike question because it is simply absurd, and if it goes down in the stenographic report that we debated so long on the general strike with 62,000 members they will laugh at us.

DEL. VEAL: I move the previous question from the standpoint that the last three members that spoke said identically the same thing. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection to granting unanimous consent on this motion to concur in the report of the committee?

DEL. FITZGERALD: I have an objection, and that is this: I would like to see this resolution stricken from this convention.

DELEGATES: No.



DEL. FITZGERALD: Now, my reason for that is this—

THE CHAIRMAN: You can get at that afterwards if you want to. Is there any objection to unanimous consent being granted on the report of the committee?

DEL. MOSKOWITZ: I want to state that if this committee would bring in this resolution with a few words of their own added to it, an explanation of why they came to this conclusion, every man that votes in favor of this concurrence would be put in a different light. Otherwise every man in this convention, unless he makes an explanation of his own, would be placed in a false light. I therefore suggest that this be referred back and brought in with the recommendation by the committee.

DEL. RYAN: I would like to ask the floor for half a minute on behalf of the committee. I would like to say that the members of the committee would be only too happy to avail themselves of the opportunity to explain their attitude on this question, but for the volubility of some of the delegates and their anxiety to get on the floor and break into the stenographic report. I, as one member of that committee, feel that I have had no opportunity to explain the reason why we recommend that the convention do not concur in this resolution 22, and I will state further for the benefit of the delegate who made the suggestion that it be referred back to the committee, as one member of that committee I would say that it would be an utterly useless proceeding and a waste of time, because we have given the matter sufficient consideration, and this is the result of our meeting yesterday for several hours.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection? Does any delegate object to being recorded as voting in favor of the motion to concur in the report of the committee?

DEL. PETRIELLA: I object.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any other?

DEL. ROGERS: I understand this motion is on the ground that in case the capitalist class see fit to execute Moyer and Haywood—

DEL. RYAN: No, it does not say that.

DEL. ROGERS: If that is the import of that resolution—

DEL. RYAN: No.

DEL. ROGERS: I think it is, therefore I, for one, protest against any such resolution as that.

DEL. RYAN: It does not say that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any further objection? If not, the Chair will declare that the motion to concur in the report of the committee is carried, with Del. Petriella objecting and voting in the negative. It is so ordered.

#### SOVEREIGN POWER OF THE CONVENTION.

DEL. RYAN (on behalf of Resolution Committee): The next is Resolution No. 44, by Del. Wade Parks:

Whereas, We are here assembled in the second I. W. W. annual convention for the purpose of carrying forward the work of organizing the workers of the country into a working class movement that shall have for its purpose the emancipation of the working class from the slave bondage of capitalism; and,

Whereas, The aims and objects of this organization should be to put the working class in possession of the economic, the means of life, in control of the machinery of production and distribution, without regard to capitalist masters; and,

Whereas, It has been declared that "there is no man who has an ounce of honesty in his makeup but recognizes the fact that there is

a continuous struggle between the two classes, and this organization will be formed, based and founded on the class struggle, having in view no compromise and no surrender, and but one object and one purpose, and that is to bring the workers of this country into the possession of the full value of the products of their toil"; and,

Whereas, We are the duly organized convention of the Industrial Workers of the World, organized for the purpose of accomplishing the above revolutionary program; and,

Whereas, Constitutions are only the products of, have their rise and spring from, revolutionary movements and are made to accomplish the purpose and objects of said revolutionary movements; and,

Whereas, The purpose and objects of the I. W. W. are more specifically defined by the Manifesto, which is the corner-stone of the future co-operative commonwealth, and the Preamble is the guiding star to the goal; therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the second annual convention of the I. W. W., have the full sovereign power to make such constitutional alterations by way of amendment, suspension or abolition of the constitution wherein and wherever we find that the said constitution obstructs, hinders or tends in any degree to defeat the purposes and objects of this revolutionary movement as outlined in the Manifesto, our corner-stone, and the Preamble, our guiding star. Be it further

Resolved, That this convention's acts and deliberations should be judged and interpreted not by the literal interpretation of any constitutional enactment, but according to the spirit and in the light of the aforesaid purposes as expressed in the Manifesto, Preamble, and W. D. Haywood's opening address in what he terms the first Continental Congress of the working class.

Introduced by

WADE PARKS.

DEL. RYAN: The Committee on Resolutions recommend that it be not concurred in.

DEL. McMULLEN: I offer a motion that we concur in the recommendation of the committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been regularly moved and seconded that the report of the committee on this resolution be concurred in. You have heard the motion; are you ready for the question?

DEL. PARKS: I will just state one additional reason why I introduced the resolution. I maintain that the resolution speaks for itself. That resolution embodies the views of a real revolutionary body. Being a revolutionary body, we have a right to exercise the full power of a revolutionary body. When the Continental Congress was called together to amend the articles of confederation they resolved that those articles of confederation could not be amended, and they constituted themselves a revolutionary body and abolished the articles of confederation, and brought forward as the result of several months of deliberation the constitution. Now, President Sherman has come upon this floor evidently this morning after holding counsel with some attorney, and he takes the very position which I intend that this convention may traverse and may oppose by the adoption of this very resolution. If we adopt this resolution we affirm again and again that we have the power to change the constitution and wipe out any officer or make any alteration where we find that a previous constitution convention has created some department or office or made some provision which tends to defeat the purposes and objects as set forth in the Preamble and Manifesto of this organization. Now, it is in the spirit of those remarks and for the purpose of establishing this as the

sovereign legislating body for the working class that I introduced this resolution. That is all I have to say.

DEL. McMULLEN: In offering this motion a thought struck me, not so much the thought of the brother here; not this that he has presented here. Of course, to the thinking mind naturally the favorable view that he takes would give rise to the negative position that could be very naturally taken from what he has said. But there is this phase which he carefully avoids—I believe he is not doing so unintentionally—and that is this: The clause in the constitution yet remains that the Executive Board of this organization has full power and all their acts have the same authority as this convention when it is assembled. Now, if that is so and this body has the power to absolutely by declaration nullify every act of any other body that has sat before it, then the Executive Board has the same power when they are in session assembled to nullify everything that this convention might do if in their judgment its spirit was not up to the spirit of the times or did not meet the requirements of the hour; and, sitting again the next day, they might reverse themselves and keep that up without end. Now, if you are squarely up by this proposition before that idea that you can sit in this manner and nullify all the acts of your predecessors, and you at the same time give to that board which your own law specifies the same power of nullifying all that you have done and in addition twenty-four hours later or an hour later they can nullify again what they had done, you would naturally come right down logically to the position of what? You are simply nil; you are nothing, absolutely, completely nothing, and do nothing if you adopt this. That is why I am in favor of the report of the committee.

DEL. DE LEON: Mr. Chairman, I agree with the recommendation of the committee, for the reason that he who would pass a resolution that the sun shines must be one who is in doubt of the fact that the sun does shine. That much for the resolution. But it is not to support the arguments of the mover; that is not why I rise to speak, since I seconded the motion of McMullen. All the arguments of the mover, however, are false, and I do not stand in favor of the recommendation of the committee on those grounds, because those grounds are a series of absurdities. It is not true that the Executive Committee can proceed to annul what this convention does. By the constitution this convention is the supreme legislative authority. By the constitution the Executive Board has to carry out the will of this convention unless reversed by a referendum vote as provided upon page 11. So that there is no danger whatever about the Executive Board doing as it pleases. It has done that hitherto, and it did so, not revolutionarily, but riotously. I therefore am against the resolution as superfluous, and in favor of the recommendation of the committee.

(Question called for.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection to granting unanimous consent to this motion to adopt the recommendation of the committee?

DEL. DUNCAN: I would like to hear the last part of that read again, after the "resolved."

The resolution proper was again read by Del. Ryan.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection to granting unanimous consent to the motion? If not, we will concur in the recommendation.

DEL. PARKS: I desire to have my vote registered against it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any other? The Chair hears none, and it declares it carried, with Del. Parks voting in the negative.

## TERMS OF SALUTATION.

DEL. RYAN (continuing report of Committee on Resolutions): We have two resolutions here, No. 11 and No. 39, and your committee offers and substitute for the resolutions. Resolution No. 11, submitted by Del. W. W. Cox, is as follows:

"Whereas, The use of the word 'brother' or 'brothers' is so exclusively used in all organizations; and,

"Whereas, This term having been so abused in the past that as a greeting term it has lost its significance, if it ever had any; and,

"Whereas, the revolutionary economic organization being distinctly different from all other forms of organization, ought to establish the use of a distinctly different term of greeting; therefore, Local 84, St. Louis, Mo.,

"Resolves, That the use of the term 'brother' be discontinued, and recommends that the terms 'comrade' and 'comrades,' which are appropriate, be unanimously used instead."

(Signed by W. W. COX, Secretary.)

DEL. MARKLEY: I move to concur.

DEL. RYAN: There is another one, No. 39, submitted by C. H. Duncan, representing Local Union 222, Spokane, Wash.:

"Whereas, We do not wish the I. W. W. to fall, like the tower of Babel, through a confusion of tongues; and,

"Whereas, The word 'comrade' is rightly applied to our fellows in a militant or destructive movement, such as an army or working class political party; and,

"Whereas, The word 'gentleman' is properly germane to the affairs of the English nobility; therefore, be it

"Resolved, That we discontinue the use of the word 'gentlemen' in addressing each other, that we may not have the appearance of offering each other insults, and of the word 'comrade,' that we may relieve ourselves from the necessity of calling those who are not our comrades by a term of unwarranted endearment; and be it further

"Resolved, That we shall be known to each other as brothers and sisters, which are good words in any constructive society, and that we recommend this usage to the entire working class.

"Fraternally submitted by

"C. H. DUNCAN,

"Representing Local Union 222, Spokane, Wash."

Your committee has considered both of these, and would like to suggest that they be not concurred in, and offer as a substitute the following:

"To the Second Annual Convention of the Industrial Workers of the World, Chicago.

"Fellow Workers:

"We herewith return resolutions No. 11 and No. 39, and recommend as a substitute for both that the title 'fellow worker' be used by members of this organization in their dealings with each other.

"Signed by the Committee."

DEL. FOOTE: I move to concur in the committee's report.

(Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been regularly moved and seconded that the report of the committee be concurred in. You have heard the motion. Is there any objection to granting unanimous consent?

DEL. RIORDAN: Mr. Chairman, it appears that the committee in reporting has not made any provision for addressing the lady members.

DEL. RYAN: Our understanding was that "fellow worker" may be considered of the neuter gender, and applied to the masculine or feminine, as you choose, and I am sure the committee deems that, so far as the male members of the organization are concerned, they will never be lacking at any time in courtesy toward a lady.

DEL. DUNCAN: As I think there has been a general usage already established in the Industrial Workers of the World and in the working class unions of the country generally, I think the word "brother" is rightly used. It is no objection to the word that some one has misused it somewhere else in fraternal societies, in the Masons and other similar organizations. It may be very true that the word has been used where it signifies nothing and no real brotherhood exists, but should we on that account change our usage? The word "comrade," rightly used in an army or in a destructive movement, has also been misused. The Salvation Army has used it, and everybody knows that they could never destroy anything, no matter how badly they wanted to, but I think there is no immediate necessity of changing our ordinary usage such as it has existed, the words "brother" and "sister" being the terms applied.

DEL. MOORE: I believe the words "brother" and "sister" and "comrade" are all the same. I think the report of the committee, "fellow workers," is appropriate on all occasions, whether talking on the street or any place, and that "fellow workers" covers all the ground.

(Question called for.)

DEL. McMULLEN: I don't quite get the idea. I understand the purpose of "comrade," or "brother," or whatever term you propose to introduce is to use a term to designate all members here, regardless of sex. The purpose, I understand, was that it should be "comrade." I understood that some one read one there to the effect that it should be "sister" and "brother." Isn't that it? But the committee, I understood, offered a recommendation that the word "fellow worker" be used.

DEL. RYAN: Yes, as a substitute for both suggestions embodied in the resolutions.

DEL. McMULLEN: Well, I admit that "comrade" occurs to us, though it does not quite seem proper in speaking to our sister workers. I don't know as I get just quite the language so as to get the idea. Generally speaking, I am perfectly willing to use the word "sister" applied to the female, and the word "brother" to the male. I believe it properly designates a brother in a common effort, or a sister in a common effort to do a common purpose, and I cannot see how the word "fellow worker" in any sense is more comprehensive or will be in any way more beneficial. I shall have to vote against the precedent suggested unless the committee have some other reason. I believe they may have more reasons.

DEL. RYAN: I should say, as a member of the committee, that when we had both of those resolutions under discussion we felt that we could not recommend that the convention should adopt either one or the other. One of them suggested that we use the terms "brothers" and "sisters." These terms have been arrogated by all capitalist fraternal societies, and as such we hardly think that we, as members of a strictly economic organization of the working class, should salute each other by such terms. So far as "comrade" is concerned, that has been fairly well arrogated to itself by two different working class political parties so long, and we feel that this is an economic organization where we meet on common ground by calling each other "fellow workers." There is no occasion for sentiment whatsoever. We agree

with the spirit of one portion of the resolution which says to call each other brothers and sisters. "Gentleman" is practically an insult, when modern conditions are taken into consideration. Now, so far as calling our lady members "fellow workers" is concerned, I would like to say that "fellow," according to my interpretation of it, is very general in its application and does not necessarily apply to the male sex. It is used in the social sense altogether, and as such, while I am not student enough to be able to interpret it as well as some, I believe it can be applied to a lady just as well as to a man.

DEL. MOORE: A question of personal privilege. Can I answer Del. McMullen's objection to the "fellow wrokers?"

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair don't know whether you can answer it or not. You can try.

DEL. MOORE: When we use the word "manhood" it applies to the male members of society. When we use the word "womanhood" it applies to the female members of society. When we use "mankind" it applies to both; it applies to society as a whole, mankind; and so does "fellow worker" apply to society as a whole. It is a little quibble.

DEL. VEAL: I move the previous question. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: The Secretary will call the roll.

DELEGATES: No roll call; unanimous consent.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection to granting unanimous consent?

DEL. McMULLEN: I desire to be recorded in the negative.

THE CHAIRMAN: Del. McMullen desires to be recorded as voting no.

DEL. FLASCHKAMP: I wish to be recorded voting against it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any other delegate?

DEL. PARKS: I want to say that I want to be recorded as not voting, because I consider it a matter of habit that you cannot legislate out of the minds of intelligent people.

The roll was called, and resulted: Total vote, 565; Yes, 432; No, 133.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is carried. The secretary will proceed.

#### POLITICAL ENDORSEMENT.

Del. Ryan, secretary of the Committee on Resolutions, then read Resolution No. 49, being a communication from Denver Local Union 125, addressed to Charles O. Sherman, General President, under date of Aug. 26, 1906, asking sanction and advice on their action in endorsing William D. Haywood for governor of Colorado.

DEL. RYAN: The committee has acted upon the matter as follows:

Chicago, Ill., Sept. 30, 1906.

To the Second Annual Convention of the Industrial Workers of the World.

Fellow Workers:

Referring to the letter from Local Union 125, Denver, Colo., dated Aug. 26, 1906:

Whereas, The above local union has endorsed the candidacy of William D. Haywood for governor of Colorado on the Socialist ticket; and,

Whereas, Any candidate nominated by any political party must subscribe to and stand upon the platform of such party; and,

Whereas, The Industrial Workers of the World endorses no political party and does not seek the endorsement of political parties; therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Industrial Workers of the World, in convention assembled, hereby instructs its new Executive Board to advise the

above named local union to withdraw its endorsement and keep within the provisions of the Preamble and constitution of the Industrial Workers of the world.

Respectfully submitted by the Resolution Committee.

MACK HENDRICKS,  
Chairman.  
PAUL AUGUSTINE.  
A. LINGENFELTER,  
ALBERT RYAN.

It was moved and seconded to concur in the report of the committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been regularly moved and seconded that the report of the committee on this resolution be concurred in. Are there any objections to granting unanimous consent? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

DEL. RYAN: I think that is all the report that your Committee on Resolutions has to submit at this time, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Committee on Ways and Means?

DEL. DUNCAN: The Committee on Ways and Means is ready to report.

#### ADDITIONAL RESOLUTIONS.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair is informed that the Secretary has some resolutions to be read.

The following resolutions were read to the convention, and referred:

##### No. U.

Whereas, A full representation of all the constituencies concerned is always desirable in legislative bodies; be it

Resolved, That Article VI, Section 3, of our constitution be amended so as to read: "Industrial Departments shall have one delegate for every 1,000 members."

Fraternally submitted by

C. H. DUNCAN,  
Representing L. U. 222, Spokane, Wash.  
(Committee on Constitution.)

##### No. V.

Whereas, The Industrial Workers of the World is the recognized enemy of the employing class, and to serve the purpose of the working class we must be active against our enemy; be it

Resolved, That I. W. W. locals shall, wherever possible, maintain wage scales as high as consistent with local conditions.

C. H. DUNCAN,  
Representing L. U. 222, Spokane, Wash.  
(Committee on Organization.)

##### No. W.

Whereas, The Cigarmakers' Union has in the past and is now aiding the employing class to smash the I. W. W. by placing large fines on their members who dare work in the interest of the I. W. W.; and,

Whereas, The Cigarmakers' International Union of America has in the past and is now scabbing on the box makers, strippers and all other workers than those that are sitting at the bench and making cigars; and,

Whereas, The C. M. I. U. of A. debars the team workers in one part of the nation and accepts them in others, thereby forcing said team

workers to remain in only a few cities and debarring them from working in the larger part of the nation in the so-called union shops under the ban of the C. M. I. U. of A.; and,

Whereas, The C. M. I. U. of A. has in the past and is now scabbing on the Spanish cigarmakers (i. e., Havana cigarmakers) through the so-called openhead work and other means known only by organized scabs; and,

Whereas, The C. M. I. U. of America debars all workers from working in the trust shops, thus forcing thousands of workers out of their so-called union, and thereby making their so-called blue label a label of the small capitalist, i. e., buckeye shops; therefore, be it

Resolved, That the I. W. W., in convention assembled, calls upon all members of the I. W. W. to refuse to longer support the blue label of the C. M. I. U. of A. or in any way aid the capitalist rat shops.

A. LINGENFELTER.

(Committee on Good and Welfare.)

No. X.

Submitted by Del. Moore:

Resolved, That no political party literature be sold at I. W. W. conventions or any other I. W. W. meetings. This to take effect at once.

(Committee on Good and Welfare.)

The convention then, at noon, was declared adjourned until two o'clock P. M.

#### AFTERNOON SESSION—OCT. 1, 1906.

The convention was called to order at one o'clock.

The Committee on Reports of Officers made the following report:

#### COMMITTEE ON REPORTS OF OFFICERS.

DEL. SHENKAN: Mr. Chairman, before presenting this report I would ask that the various committees to which various parts of the Secretary-Treasurer's as well as the President's reports are referred, take notes of the particular parts which are referred to the respective committees, because we did not get enough copies of both so as to give the different committees the parts referred to them for their consideration.

To the Officers and Delegates of the Second Annual Convention of the Industrial Workers of the World:

Comrades:

We have examined the reports of the President and General Secretary-Treasurer, and beg leave to submit the same to you for your consideration.

#### REPORT OF GENERAL PRESIDENT.

1. The committee does not concur in the form of introduction, to-wit: "Ladies and Gentlemen and Delegates," and recommend that the term "comrades" be used in addressing the working class.

3. We disagree with our President regarding the general strike, and contend that a general lockout of the capitalist class is the method by which we propose to emancipate our class. We believe that the general strike can be employed temporarily as a means to wring concessions from the capitalist class from time to time. The committee believes that a protracted general strike would be no less than an insane act on the part of the working class.

5. We recommend that this be referred to the incoming G. E. B. for future reference.



**THE CHAIRMAN:** You have heard the recommendation of the committee as to the first recommendation. What is your pleasure in regard to that?

It was moved and seconded to concur. Unanimously agreed to.

**DEL. SHENKAN** (continuing report): "We recommend that paragraphs 5, 6 and 7 be referred to the incoming G. E. B., and that the cause of these 120 unions becoming delinquent be learned, also that organizers be sent among them for the purpose of reorganizing them into the I. W. W. in good standing." This section refers to the part of the President's report wherein it is stated that for various reasons 120 unions became delinquent for non-payment of dues.

It was moved and seconded to concur in the recommendation of the committee. Unanimously carried.

**DEL. SHENKAN** (continuing report): The committee recommends that Sections 8 and 9 be referred to the Committee on Organization. I believe it has already been appointed, and Comrade Parks has got a copy of it. It refers to methods of organization.

"Section 10. The committee believes that it was the duty of the President as general executive officers of the I. W. W. to consider the appeal of the Transportation Department and place the matter before the G. E. B. for prompt and faithful action.

"Section 11 is referred to the Committee on Education.

"Sections 12 and 13, regarding the label, we recommend that the label shall never be placed in the hands of the capitalist class, and shall only be used in such places as are completely organized under the I. W. W. banner. Referred to Committee on Education.

"Section 14. We disagree with our President regarding organizing in the West in preference to the East. He said that conditions in the West are superior to those of the East, and argued that the East should not be organized until the West is thoroughly organized. The committee believes that for the reason that the conditions in the East are deplorable is the very reason why organizing work is necessary in the East, that the standard of living may be improved, thus accomplishing a more uniform standard of working class solidarity."

"Sections 15 and 16. The committee disagrees with our President's conception of what constitutes industrial unionism. He contends that one charter for one industry in one locality is contrary to the constitution because it centralizes the power of the whole industry in the hands of the members of one local union. The committee holds that it is the necessity for this very form of organization which he condemns that called this organization into being. Regarding the statement that these matters should be considered from a business standpoint, this seems like the argument of one engaged in the theatrical profession, who is more concerned in the box-office receipts than for the welfare of the working class.

"Section 17. As to the report of the editor of the 'Industrial Worker' as embodied in our President's report, the committee recommends that the editor hereafter submit his report separately and personally to the convention. The committee recommends that the 'Industrial Worker' be published weekly, also that the editor's report be seriously considered by the convention.

"Section 18. Regarding the amendments to the constitution proposed by our President, we refer them to the Committee on Constitution.

"Conclusion. Because of the manner in which our ex-President has compiled his report dealing in glittering generalities, eliminating con-

structive ideas, it is made mandatory upon this committee to inform this convention that it could not report on many of the paragraphs."

THE CHAIRMAN: Is that all you have got on the President's report?

DEL. SHENKAN: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: That completes the report of the Committee on Officers' Reports on the President's report.

DEL. MOSKOVITZ: I move that the recommendations of the committee be concurred in. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded that the report of the Committee on Officers' Reports be concurred in.

DEL. MOSKOVITZ: With the exception of that part that referred to the weekly publication of the "Industrial Worker."  
(Seconded.)

DEL. DUNCAN: That has already been disposed of.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection to that clause referring to the weekly publication of the "Industrial Worker?"

DEL. McMULLEN: I do not agree with the findings in any way, especially as so many of those findings are simply expressions of opinion as to which the committee make no recommendation. I would have no objection to the report of this committee being filed as to their findings, but there are some recommendations that they make that I certainly am opposed to. I am opposed to making the editor of the official organ an independent official not recognizing the authority of the real officials of this organization. That is the practical meaning of that in regard to his reporting to this organization. Now, if the committee has read those sections or paragraphs here wherein they are criticizing everything and then given us a constructive view as they wished it, I would be able better to judge just exactly what they are basing their statements upon. They do not do that, and as I heard the President's report I take several exceptions to the word "ex" most especially.

DEL. SHENKAN: There is no such word used.

DEL. McMULLEN: The word "ex-President" is used, and was read by you, my brother. I shall object to that, and I desire to express my views on it fully. If I am the only one voting that way I desire to be so recorded voting no.

DEL. FOX: I am opposed to ruling out the "ex" there. Put it in also before the other parts of the recommendation.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any other delegate that desires to be recorded in the negative?

DEL. PARKS: I suggest that if he objects to the "ex," that we put the word "deposed" in there.

DEL. HENDRICKS: I desire to be recorded voting no.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any other delegate?

DEL. McDONALD: I also desire to be recorded voting no.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any other delegate? If not, the Chair will declare this motion carried. So ordered.

#### REPORT ON GENERAL SECRETARY-TREASURER'S REPORT.

DEL. SHENKAN (continuing report of Committee on Reports of Officers): "We recommend that on account of the highly intellectual and educational matter contained in the report of the General Secretary-Treasurer, that it be accepted by this convention as a whole, and that, as there are many typographical errors which in some instances have destroyed the meaning of a sentence, that he be instructed to give close attention to the proofreading and have such errors corrected. We would also suggest that a nominal price be given to the pamphlet to

defray expense of printing and mailing same if it should happen to be called for in large quantities. We also wish to apologize to Comrade Trautmann for not covering his report more fully. The committee did not wish to delay the convention, and as we only had the report in our hands a short time it did not receive the attention merited.

#### FINANCES.

"1st. We recommend that the General Executive Board be instructed to co-operate with the General Secretary-Treasurer in adopting a standard financial system of bookkeeping to guard against a possible repetition of errors made by having too many separate accounts, as per his recommendation made on page 18, paragraph 3.

"2nd. The following sections, entitled, page 20, 'Growth of Organization,' page 22, 'Structure of Industrial Unionism,' page 24, 'Industrial Councils,' are concurred in by this committee and referred to committees on Constitution and Organization.

"3rd. Page 25. section entitled 'Reduction of Dues,' referred to Committee on Constitution.

#### INTERNATIONAL MUSICAL UNION.

"4th. Page 16. The committee concurs in the recommendations of the General Secretary-Treasurer relative to the International Musical Union that they should be organized on the principles laid down by the I. W. W. We believe that any organization that does not hew to the basic principles of our constitution, like barnacles attached to the hull of a ship, stay the progress of the industrial movement.

"5th. Page 28. section entitled 'The Industrial Workers and the Farmers,' referred to the Committee on Organization.

"6th. Page 33. 'Proposed Relations with Working Class Organizations Abroad.' We recommend that the General Secretary-Treasurer be instructed to establish such relations with industrial unions in foreign countries that will gain recognition for a 'Universal Transfer Card,' and also take steps toward the establishment of an International Industrial Congress with the ultimate object in view of having the Industrial Workers of the World a reality and not a myth.

#### TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT.

"7th. The committee agrees with the Secretary-Treasurer's report on Transportation Department, and coincides with his recommendation that the I. W. W. profit from past experience in giving this department protection not only against the intrigues of capitalism, but also against the iniquitous attacks of craft brotherhoods, which are now commonly designated as the watch dogs of the corporations, and recommend that such practical knowledge as can be obtained from reliable sources be used as educational matter in the constructive work of a constitution for this department.

"8th. Page 34. section entitled 'The Labor Press supporting the I. W. W.; Basis for Mutual Co-operation,' referred to Committee on Education.

"9th. Page 36. section entitled 'The First of May,' referred to Committee on Good and Welfare.

"10th. Page 39. section entitled 'Conclusion,' referred to committees on Organization and Education.

"W. E. McCUE.  
I. SHENKAN, Sec'y.  
GEO. ABBOTT.  
WM. J. PINKERTON.  
W. E. TULLAR,  
Committee."

THE CHAIRMAN: What is your pleasure in regard to the report of the committee?

It was moved and seconded to concur.

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been regularly moved and seconded that we concur in this report.

DEL. SIMS: Is this supposed to be the final report of the Committee on Officers' Reports?

DEL. SHENKAN: I believe I know what Comrade Sims has reference to. You have reference to the financial end of it, have you not?

DEL. SIMS: Yes, the financial end of it.

DEL. SHENKAN: We had nothing to do with the financial end of the Secretary-Treasurer's report, if I understand it correctly. That is the function of the Auditing Committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any further remarks? Are there any objections to granting unanimous consent?

DEL. MOSKOVITZ: I move to amend that the report of the committee on the General Secretary-Treasurer's report shall be referred to the incoming administration for future guidance.

THE CHAIRMAN: An amendment has been offered that the report be concurred in—

DEL. MOSKOVITZ: Be used as a reference for future guidance.

THE CHAIRMAN: —be used as a reference for the future guidance of the incoming Executive Board.

DEL. MOSKOVITZ: Of the incoming administration.

THE CHAIRMAN: Of the administration. You have heard this amendment. Was the amendment accepted?

No objections were heard.

THE CHAIRMAN: The amendment has been accepted by the mover of the motion. Are there any objections to granting unanimous consent?

DEL. HENDRICKS: I just want to ask a question, Mr. Chairman. If I understand right there are two committees appointed to take charge of the Financial Secretary's report, one committee on the financial end of it and the other for the introductory to the financial report. Am I right?

DEL. SHENKAN: No. As far as the finances are concerned the whole proposition is practically referred to the General Executive Board in conjunction with the Secretary-Treasurer, that a financial system may be adopted, a proper system of bookkeeping, &c.

DEL. HENDRICKS: I am not speaking of what is going to be adopted. I am speaking about what has been done. I want to take exception in regard to the financial report of this organization.

DEL. SHENKAN: Well, then, I would have to refer you to the Auditing Committee. That does not come under the head of our report.

DEL. HENDRICKS: It has nothing to do with the books?

DEL. SHENKAN: No. the Auditing Committee make their report on the financial part of it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any objections to granting unanimous consent to the motion?

DEL. McMULLEN: I desire to be recorded as voting in the negative.

THE CHAIRMAN: Del. McMullen voting no. Any other delegate?

DEL. McDONALD: I also desire to be recorded voting no.

THE CHAIRMAN: Del. McDonald voting no.

DEL. McDONALD: I want to state my ground, Mr. Chairman. My grounds are practically these: In the Secretary's report, in all the pages, it does not matter where they are, when the Secretary is making his report he speaks of the financial standing, it does not matter

what the introductory remarks. He ought to follow that up with a statement of the organization's finances. This the Secretary did not do, and for that reason I oppose endorsing the statement or the report of the Secretary-Treasurer. I might go further and state that I am in possession of sufficient information at this time to state that the Secretary's report as far as the finances are concerned would not be very satisfactory if he had made it. Now, it seems to me that the very most important factor in this organization is the Financial Secretary's part of it in receiving moneys and disbursing them, and I think every delegate here ought to be in possession and know what funds were brought in and paid out and for what, and on that ground I do not think this convention has any right to receive the Secretary-Treasurer's report without the financial standing of this organization submitted with it.

DEL. SHENKAN: Mr. Chairman, I merely want again to reiterate what I stated before, that it was not the function of this committee to go over the financial end of the Secretary-Treasurer's report. It was the function of the Auditing Committee to perform that work.

DEL. McMULLEN: What did you do with that part of it?

DEL. SHENKAN: What did you do? You were on that committee.

DEL. McMULLEN: We never had it.

DEL. SHENKAN: You were on the Auditing Committee.

DEL. McMULLEN: Yes, I know I am. We cannot do anything with this.

DEL. SHENKAN: There was no financial report came to me.

DEL. McMULLEN: Then that settles the whole thing. Then there is no report.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any other delegate desires to be recorded in the negative?

DEL. HENDRICKS: Register me against it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any other delegate?

DEL. McKNIGHT: And me.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any other delegate?

DEL. MAHONEY: I wish to be recorded voting against this.

THE CHAIRMAN: Del. Mahoney. Is there any other delegate? If not the Chair will declare the motion carried. So ordered.

#### FINANCIAL MATTERS.

DEL. McCUE: Mr. Chairman—

DEL. HENDRICKS: I want to ask a question. I want to ask the Financial Secretary if the Auditing Committee has his report.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: The Auditing Committee has my report.

DEL. McCUE: That is just the question I was going to ask, whether it is too late to receive the Secretary's report. I don't believe the Secretary is ready to give his report.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: No.

DEL. McCUE: I don't think it was complete at the time he made this recommendation. I guess if it had been complete he would have had it here then.

DEL. FOX: I want to clear up a misapprehension that may arise here. Some delegates seem to think—

DEL. MOSKOVITZ: A point of order.

DEL. FOX: Well, just wait one moment, please. Everybody else—

THE CHAIRMAN: What is your point of order?

DEL. MOSKOVITZ: My point of order is that since there is nothing before the house only this report, if the Committee on Auditing has anything to report we will hear it.

DEL. FOX: Why don't you wait till the committee talks before you interrupt?

A DELEGATE: That is the idea.

DEL. FOX: You waste more time. When I get up here I talk about half a minute at the most. You fellows talk for days and say nothing. I want to clear up a misapprehension that has arisen here. Some delegates seem to think the Auditing Committee is going to go over all the financial accounts. That is a mistake. If they had wanted the financial account they should have asked for it from the Secretary-Treasurer. We are only going to inquire into the merits of the expenditures.

DEL. McMULLEN: As a member of that committee, the same that that brother (referring to Del. Fox), I will say that if we are to inquire just as the chairman says, as to how the money was expended and if it was expended in the manner and form that this organization desired, we have got to see every voucher, we have got to see what the purpose was so that we can say it was expended rightly or wrongly. Now, that committee would have to do just what you thought it would not have to do. They would have to stay here about three weeks. Fear in mind this, that if the Secretary-Treasurer has submitted a report to the Auditing Committee I have not seen it. I mean by that an itemized statement of receipts and expenditures. Now, there was a report coming from the special examiner, whatever we call him, or accountant. Then there is a statement coming from the General Executive Board wherein they allege that the accounts were in such a bad state of affairs that they had to call in this special examiner.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: That is not true.

DEL. McMULLEN: That is the statement from the Executive Board; one of them at least.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: That is not true.

DEL. McMULLEN: We are saying the same thing. That is the way the thing is. They say also the bookkeeper, who is Bro. Trautmann—they say the accounts were so that they can't make head or tail of them. If you really want a thorough examination you have got to authorize this committee to look into the different departments and then report as to whether the money was lawfully or unlawfully, in their judgment, expended, and if you do this it is absolutely a farce to have the committee acting on it first. Now, up to this time I have never seen an itemized statement with the Secretary-Treasurer's name on it, of the accounts, receipts and expenditures in this convention.

DEL. MARKLEY: It would be hard for Bro. McMullen to see this, because he absolutely refused to serve.

DEL. DUNCAN: A point of order. The Committee on Ways and Means was called upon to report last Saturday, and we were unable to do so on account of the absence of one of our members with the papers. If you want that report now you can have it.

DEL. SIMS: Mr. Chairman, I want to get more information concerning this financial report proposition. Now, it was told me by this Committee on Reports of Officers that part of it was left for the Auditing Committee, and when is the Auditing Committee going to report?

THE CHAIRMAN: Just as quickly as we can reach it.

DEL. OLDBERG: The committee met on Saturday, and they were supposed to thrash out their affairs, and since then some of the committee failed to attend to his duty, and therefore it was laid over.

Now I think it is in order to call upon them if they are ready with their recommendations, etc.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Ways and Means Committee will report next, so far as the Chair's ruling is concerned.

#### COMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTION.—REFERENDUM AND SUPREME AUTHORITY.

Del. Kinneally, from the Committee on Constitution, then made the following report:

DEL. KINNEALLY: This is a resolution in reference to a referendum vote, marked "D," introduced by Del. Duncan. The committee recommends that a clause be added to the constitution to read as follows:

"The convention of the I. W. W. is the supreme legislative body of the organization, and its enactments are of legal effect unless reversed upon a referendum vote of the whole membership, touching any and all amendments to the organic law which the convention may adopt. On all such amendments they shall be submitted to a referendum vote by the General Executive Board within thirty days after the adjournment of the convention. The vote shall close thirty days after the date of the call for the referendum."

DEL. KINNEALLY: The committee recommends the adoption of this presentation.

DEL. FOX: I move to concur. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been regularly moved and seconded that the report of the Constitution Committee in regard to the referendum vote be concurred in. Are there any remarks?

DEL. McMULLEN: I did not notice in there where they make any provision for submitting it to the departments. I followed the report quite closely. They provide for submitting it before the locals. I desire to have in there the word also "departments" as well as locals. My understanding of the constitution was that the departments would receive it as well as the locals. Or, understand this, Mr. President: The locals of the departments are not locals of the I. W. W. in the sense that there is a direct communication established. But if there is a provision for submitting it to the departments and then they to their locals, I will cheerfully vote for that. I would ask that the committee be requested to incorporate that word "departments" in there with the locals. Would there be any objection on the part of the secretary of the committee to having that in?

DEL. KINNEALLY: There is on my part.

DEL. McMULLEN: None on your part?

DEL. KINNEALLY: There is on my part. I can't speak for the committee.

DEL. McMULLEN: I can't vote for the proposition, then, in this shape.

DEL. DE LEON: Any such provision as Del. McMullen requests would be superfluous. Del. McMullen, if I caught his words, claims that this recommendation refers to a vote of the locals. The word "local" is not mentioned in the recommendation. If I understood Del. McMullen correctly to say that it should state "department" as well as "locals," Del. McMullen has been speaking to a motion that is not before the house. The recommendation says a general vote of the whole membership, and the membership will be reached and should be reached in the legitimate and regular channels. Where there is a department the G. E. B. should communicate with the departmental authorities and trust that they will do their duty to reach their mem-

bers. Where there is no department, then the G. E. B. will go direct to the locals. That is the sense of the recommendation, and no other sense can be attached to it except upon the presupposition wrongly made by McMullen that it states locals there, whereas it does not.

DEL. McMULLEN: Will the secretary kindly read that again?

Del. Kinneally again read the section.

DEL. McMULLEN: I will state that I accept the explanation made by Del. De Leon. As it does not refer to locals and does not refer to any particular membership I will admit that it means his interpretation, the entire membership.

DEL. MCINTOSH: That is what it says.

DEL. McMULLEN: No, it does not say that about submitting the last part where the Executive Board is instructed. My first impression was that it referred to locals, but with the understanding that it goes to the entire membership I am perfectly satisfied. The first part certainly does contain what Bro. De Leon contends, and I assume it would be a fair interpretation to contend that that was the meaning, but with that distinct understanding that it is the meaning I am perfectly satisfied.

DEL. DUNCAN: I have no fault to find with the recommendation of the committee as far as it goes, but it leaves me in doubt as to one point. I do not see any provision made in there as to how the referendum vote may be initiated. It seems to me that it ought to be defined. It may be defined somewhere in the constitution.

A DELEGATE: It is.

DEL. DE LEON: I will state to the delegate that the provision embodied that part and the part we have acted upon. We have acted upon this part and have reported, and we shall report upon the second part also.

DEL. McMULLEN: There is a very important question there, and that is this: the Executive Board is instructed to do that, submit that within 30 days after the convention adjourns. Then there is only 30 days afterwards to collect the vote. Now, it would be simply impossible in some of our locals to get it collected. They meet only once a month and they could not possibly report back to this office in 30 days, and I rise at this time to move to strike out the word "30" and insert the word "60," which I believe will give ample time. I offer that as an amendment to this motion.

DEL. DE LEON: I wish to say that for one I do not object to that amendment.

DEL. McMULLEN: You do not object?

DEL. DE LEON: No. I suspected that the period was rather short, and I will favor 60, and I think the committee will so consider it.

DEL. McMULLEN: That will give 30 days to submit to a vote and 60 days to collect that vote.

DEL. DE LEON: 60 days after the call.

DEL. McMULLEN: Yes. If there is no objection I would like to have that in.

DEL. KINNEALLY: There is no objection as far as I am concerned.

DEL. McMULLEN: Then that will be substituted.

DEL. KINNEALLY: Yes.

DEL. MAHONEY: I understand, then, that the majority of all the votes cast will mean the legislative power of the organization. After it is submitted to the entire membership of the organization a majority of the vote, of the returns, becomes the legislative power of the organization. Is that correct? It is not necessary that the entire



membership of every local union vote on this, but that the entire membership vote on the proposition.

THE CHAIRMAN: As I remember, it will be submitted to the entire membership, but the vote disclosed is what decides the result.

DEL. MAHONEY: It would appear to me that it would be more appropriate for it to state that the only way the constitution can be amended was through the convention and then submitting it to a referendum vote for approval or ratification; that all sections receiving the ratification of the membership through the referendum vote would become the law and those not receiving it would not become the law. I think that would sound more appropriate than to say that unless it was defeated by the membership at large the convention was the supreme power.

DEL. DE LEON: Mr. Chairman, the theory advanced by Mahoney proceeds upon a theory that is not the theory of the constitution under which we meet. He says he thinks it would be more appropriate. Perhaps so and perhaps not so. He has advanced no reason why that would be more appropriate. I wish to advance a reason that the committee held why it would be more appropriate to adhere to the theory of the constitution under which we met. The clause which I read, which turned upon the question of the referendum, clearly indicates that the theory of the constitution is that this body is the legislative body. If this body is not the legislative body, if whatever it does it does simply as a committee of the membership at large, why should this body meet at all? Why not have these various sections, departments or whatever we may call them, send in their various propositions and have the membership at large patch up a crazy quilt upon that principle? The Committee on Constitution of last year's convention realized that where large masses are affected it needs representative government; recognized the impossibility of millions of men or thousands of men meeting and deliberating. It cannot be done. The existence of the convention is a denial of the theory upon which Mahoney's proposition rests. This convention is the precursor of future governments of these United States. A government is predicated upon the theory—I mean a government of the masses—that the masses cannot be in council, that the masses cannot meet, that the masses cannot deliberate individually, and consequently that it must be done through representative men, therefore through a representative body. Consequently this convention stands upon that principle, the principle and the mold into which the first constitution was cast, that the convention by reason of all these things that I mention is the legislative body. Differently, however, from capitalist government, this convention or this government is not absolute. The rank and file have a veto upon its actions and the rank and file should be the court of last resort. It was loosely provided for in the old constitution. We are providing for it here concretely. We are providing for it here under regular form. For that reason we hold that the convention is the legislative body. What it does is law, subject to the action of the referendum. To reverse that is simply to say that we meet like the Gompers crowd for the sake of banqueting, for the sake of junketing, for the sake of spending time. If we meet simply to agree and submit to the rank and file there is no reason you can give why this convention should meet, none whatever; this convention would then be simply a waster of money, a waster of time and a fomenter of enmity. Since this convention is not called for that, since it is called in view of the necessity of the situation of having to

legislate for the masses, it is a legislative body, a law-making power subject to a last appeal to our constituents.

DEL. McMULLEN: I just got an important view, and got some light on the matter which did not occur to me prior. The remarks of Bros. Mahoney and De Leon show conclusively just the intent and purposes of what this is intended to do. As I take it that Bro. De Leon's remarks are explanatory of the idea, it means this: that unless there is a demand for the referendum, then all the acts passed by this convention will be law without any occasion whatever for approval or disapproval of the rank and file.

DEL. DE LEON: Not at all.

DEL. McMULLEN: Now, I was assuming that the proposition there was that there would be a submission of everything that was enacted here to the rank and file for their vote, and if they did not vote to approve it the same would not become law. But I see from the phrases used there which Mahoney points out that if it does not receive disapproval then it is law. Or in other words you want the force and effect of a possible chance of the membership voting yes and not stopping to consider the qualification, if you read it close enough to notice what it might mean, that they might fail to vote whatever. Those things are ordinarily done in putting questions. Many men will put them so that they will get an affirmative vote, and every part of them agree to just such measures. So it would be in this instance. Now, I thought we were receiving this thing on that basis; that an article or an act that did not receive the approval of the membership would not become a law. But my eyes are now opened to this thing. If they do not receive disapproval they remain law. Now, it is plainly evident just what is attempted here. I claim that this is in no sense a referendum proposition. In my humble judgment this is a means to evade it. Any fair-minded man looking at the referendum from the standpoint from which I have heretofore heard it considered, with the views presented there by the brother, will agree to this: that whatever action we take here should meet with the approval of the parties who sent us here, either in the affirmative to make it law, or if they fail in giving it an affirmative vote it does not become law. Now, I cannot vote for that with that understanding of it as it is. It wants to be clear and specific, that statement, that anything submitted as an act of this convention requiring a referendum vote must receive approval from the majority of the members or it does not become the law of this organization, and those things failing to receive that approval are not law.

(Question called for.)

THE CHAIRMAN: The secretary will call the roll.

DEL. MAHONEY: Mr. President, I would understand that this amendment to the constitution that is submitted at this time does not apply to the amendments that have been passed prior to this. I would take it that this amendment is dilatory, practically speaking, and does not become effective at this time of submitting the amendments that are offered to this constitution to the rank and file of the organization for a referendum vote. I take it that the only way this constitution shall be amended is through the convention, then submit it to a referendum vote; that any article that does not receive a majority on that referendum vote as an amendment to the constitution does not become a law in this organization. If we are going to have a referendum proposition in our constitution let it be a referendum, not let it be a juggling affair as this convention has been. There is conclusive proof established by the membership of the Western Federation of Miners

that they demand a referendum vote on all constitutional amendments; that they took that referendum vote on the last constitution and that they will take it on this constitution. And my position is that that is correct, and if you are going to put a referendum proposition in your constitution put it in there as a referendum and not as an obstacle that will stand in the way of a referendum.

DEL. HAVER: I would like to ask a question in regard to this referendum. Bro. Mahoney of the Western Federation of Miners wanted a referendum on everything that is in the constitution. When the referendum was taken in regard to postponing the convention I believe that the referendum vote was a very small vote. I would like to know whether the miners voted on that, because I believe there was only 1,200 votes cast. Isn't that right, Sec. Trautmann?

SEC. TRAUTMANN: No. There were more cast. About 3,000 votes were cast and about 1,300 were miners. But in the last referendum there were only about 800 of the Mining Department.

DEL. HAVER: Where is the sense of a referendum where you have got 60,000 people and only 3,000 vote?

DEL. MAHONEY: I might state in answer to the brother that it was through the Mining Department that the first request was made, and the request was that it be submitted to the local unions of the Industrial Workers of the World to see if they were satisfied to postpone. Consequently there was no necessity of the Mining Department, after petitioning the local unions, to vote again on postponing the convention. Had the local unions voted on postponing the convention the Mining Department was not going to take the position of forcing them to postpone it.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: I wish to correct that statement that the Mining Department asked the Executive Board of the I. W. W. to postpone the convention, and then the members of the General Executive Board could not see their way clear and demanded that a referendum be called.

DEL. RYAN: I was a delegate to the last convention of the Western Federation of Miners, and that matter came up there. Sec. Trautmann explained to the convention that the referendum had reached his office too late to be sent to the members of the Western Federation of Miners to vote on the question of postponing the convention, and the referendum was sent out, and by the time he received it it had to be closed up a week from that date, and as a consequence it would be a waste of time to ask that the locals take the matter up for consideration and action as the Department of Mining. On that account a resolution was drawn up and introduced into the fourteenth annual convention setting forth these facts and embodied in the report of the proceedings, saying that owing to the lateness of the date on which the referendum had been received from the Industrial Workers' headquarters in Chicago the convention deemed it was not necessary to submit it to a referendum, and I wish to go on record as saying that the delegates representing the general membership were in favor of seeing the convention postponed. Those are the facts of the case, and they are here in the proceedings.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: There were two representatives voted. Was that on the second referendum vote?

DEL. RYAN: Yes.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: But I mean on the first referendum vote.

DEL. MAHONEY: That is correct, Del. Ryan, on the second referendum.

DEL. RYAN: Yes.

DEL. MAHONEY: The referendum reached there while our convention was in session.

DEL. RYAN: Yes.

DEL. MAHONEY: There would not have been time for the local unions to have got it out, let alone getting back the returns.

The roll call was then begun.

DEL. HOLMES: I would like to make an explanation. I am compelled to vote no because I have very specific and binding instructions to stand for the referendum in the fullest sense. I am compelled to vote no.

The roll call was resumed, continued as far as Moore.

DEL. MOORE: I want to ask a question before I vote. Do I understand that all the amendments to the constitution are to be sent out to a referendum vote?

A DELEGATE: Yes.

DEL. MOORE: Well, I vote yes.

The roll call was then completed and the result announced as follows: Total vote, 566; Yes, 326; No, 240.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is carried. The secretary will proceed.

#### POLITICAL ENDORSEMENT.

DEL. KINNEALLY (continuing report of Committee on Constitution): At the last convention of the Western Federation of Miners, held in Denver, the following resolution was introduced for the action of this convention:

"Resolved, That the second annual convention of the Industrial Workers of the World shall adopt and submit to a referendum vote of the membership for their ratification so that it may become a part of the Preamble of the constitution of the Industrial Workers of the World, the following: 'That the I. W. W. does not desire the endorsement of any political party, neither will the I. W. W. endorse any political organization.'

"The committee recommends the adoption of the following:

"Whereas, The policy of the organization towards political parties is as set forth in the Preamble, that the I. W. W. shall keep its hands off political parties;

"Whereas, The Mining Department of this organization has at its late convention in Denver reaffirmed this policy;

"Whereas, In violation of this principle of non-intervention in the conflict between political parties—a principle enacted by the general organization and by its department—the 'Miners' Magazine' did, since then, take a hand in the conflicts between political parties by endorsing one party in the state of Pennsylvania and assailing the rival party;

"Whereas, Such act of insubordination on the part of the 'Miners' Magazine' has been productive of turmoil and mischief only, and the evil results thereof to the I. W. W. have vindicated the wisdom of the policy towards political parties adopted by the I. W. W. and expressly reaffirmed by the Mining Department;

"Whereas, The constitution of the I. W. W., Article II, Section 5, provides for the procedure to be observed in the taking of referendum votes;

"Whereas, Obedient to that procedure, the Mining Department has, in order to emphasize the policy of the I. W. W. towards political parties, called for a referendum vote upon that concrete subject; therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the following question (as called for by the Mining Department) be forthwith submitted to a general referendum vote of the membership of the I. W. W.: 'The I. W. W. does not desire the endorsement of any political party, neither will the I. W. W. endorse any political organization.'"

DEL. SHENKAN: I move its adoption. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been regularly moved and seconded that the report of the committee on this matter be adopted. You have heard the motion; are you ready for the question?

DEL. McMULLEN: Mr. President, from whom does that last resolution come, that last set of resolutions? Who signed that?

THE CHAIRMAN: The Committee on Constitution.

DEL. McMULLEN: Does that come from the Committee on Constitution?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

DEL. McMULLEN: This recommendation in reference to the "Miners' Magazine," does that come from the Committee on Constitution?

DEL. KINNEALLY: The Committee on Constitution.

DEL. McMULLEN: Now, I would think the resolution should contain these particular words: "Are hereby instructed to do all in their power to have said convention adopt." Have you got in there that this convention shall adopt? I find only that you are recommending that this shall be submitted to a referendum.

DEL. KINNEALLY: That is the request of your convention.

DEL. McMULLEN: They say that this convention shall adopt the same as they adopt any law. That is the action of the convention of the Western Federation of Miners.

DEL. KINNEALLY: It is unnecessary to readopt what is already in the constitution by a referendum in accordance with the wish of the Western Federation of Miners. We do as you request, send this to a referendum vote.

DEL. McMULLEN: We most respectfully differ from that. It is not in the present constitution. That is why we are offering it. The entire convention of the Western Federation of Miners could not see it in the present constitution of the Industrial Workers of the World, and therefore the necessity for it and for our action there in Denver, and we specifically added in there the word "adopt"—that this convention, speaking for the I. W. W., adopt and submit it to a referendum vote of the entire organization. Now, I insist that that word "adopt" shall go in there. I so signed it with the understanding that that was a reproduction of this Denver resolution. You find my signature there, do you not? I assert to you that that is the way I signed, and I believe McDonald done the same thing.

DEL. KINNEALLY: That is right.

DEL. McMULLEN: And I believe Bro. Ryan will bear me out that we were signing the Denver resolution. Now, that should contain the word "adopt." You have the proceedings, have you not, Bro. Ryan?

DEL. KINNEALLY: The word "adopt" was in the resolution.

DEL. McMULLEN: If you will kindly read that to the—

DEL. RYAN: I will state that I drew up that resolution and submitted it to the Committee on Constitution. Before so doing of course I showed it to you and all the other delegates, and we read it over and it was word for word exactly as we found it in our instructions, page 268; the resolution which you and other delegates introduced; it is word for word.

DEL. McMULLEN: Do you say it is word for word the same as the resolution on page 268?

DEL. RYAN: Yes.

DEL. McMULLEN: I will accept Bro. Ryan's statement. You and I agree that it is a reproduction of the resolution on page 268.

DEL. RYAN: I ask Del. McMullen here to see that this is a verbatim reproduction of our instructions. You will find it in the hands of the secretary, and I would rather you would be positive before you go on there.

DEL. McMULLEN: I will read this so as to make it plain:

"Resolved, By the Western Federation of Miners, the Department of Mining of the Industrial Workers of the World, that the delegates to the next annual convention be and are hereby instructed to do all in their power to have said convention adopt and submit to a referendum vote for ratification, so that it may become a part of the Preamble of the Industrial Workers of the World, the following: 'That the Industrial Workers of the World does not desire the endorsement of any political party, neither will the Industrial Workers of the World endorse any political organization.'"

Now, that is exactly what is here, and if that is in the resolution—

DEL. KINNEALLY: That is quoted right here.

DEL. McMULLEN: I didn't observe the word "adopted" in it. If it is there, all right.

DEL. KINNEALLY: It is verbatim right here.

DEL. McMULLEN: I am in favor of having that adopted as per my instructions as a delegate here, but that roast that comes from this committee, I am in favor of that being stricken out, because I don't know what took place in the state of Pennsylvania, and it is a general assertion that such did take place without a statement of the evidence to substantiate it and without giving the editor of the "Miners' Magazine," Bro. O'Neill, an opportunity to say whether he did or did not in that state endorse some political party as it is charged but not proven.

DEL. RYAN: Do you read the "Miners' Magazine?"

DEL. McMULLEN: I certainly do, and read it quite carefully. I will admit if it is there, the substance of your statement, that Bro. O'Neill should stand on what he has published there, and I believe he will. I most emphatically deny that I have ever seen any such proposition. And at this time I offer this motion, that this recommendation wherein the "Miners' Magazine" is roasted for not being in line with this proposed amendment be stricken from the same. I would like to have a second to that. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been regularly moved and seconded as an amendment to the motion that that portion of the committee's report referring to the "Miners' Magazine" be stricken from the resolution. Are you ready for the question?

DEL. DE LEON: Del. McMullen makes two points. One point is that the instructions from his convention are that we "adopt"—that this thing be adopted and sent to a referendum; which is the very thing that the Committee on Constitution recommend. He says he wants the word "adopt" itself. I do not know whether the word "adopt" is in that recommendation or not, but the committee was quite certain as a fact that the recommendation is an adoption. Whether that word is there or not cuts no figure. As to the sending to a referendum, that is also recommended. Now, he objects to what he calls a roast to a gentleman whose name does not appear, and says he does not know how things are in Pennsylvania. Pennsylvania is not in evidence. The organ of the Mining Department is in evidence, and we are bound to take judicial notice of facts. Everybody knows

that since this thing was adopted by the Mining Department of this organization the organ of that department, located in Denver, did endorse one political party in the state of Pennsylvania and has been assailing the rival party. Now, this proposition that we do not endorse any party and ask no endorsement is the position of the I. W. W., and when it comes from the Mining Department we can put no construction upon it other than it is their desire to make positive a thing which according to McMullen was not quite clear to them. And since it must be their desire to make that thing positive it must also be their intent to insist on the enforcement of the proposition beginning with the organ of their department. I do not know—I did not hear McMullen—whether he denied that he had seen these articles in the "Miners' Magazine."

DEL. McMULLEN: I desire to make that plain. I deny ever seeing any such articles.

DEL. DE LEON: All right. He denies having seen them. The rest of you have seen them, most of you?

DELEGATES: Yes.

DEL. DE LEON: Ryan has seen them, St. John has seen them, Heslewood has seen them. McMullen says he has not seen them. I know that sometimes things that appear in the papers that I ought to read I have not seen, having so many things to read.

A DELEGATE: To what date do you refer?

DEL. DE LEON: Excuse me—

A DELEGATE: Could you give the date of the issue, when that appeared?

DEL. DE LEON: Last week again, right along for the last two months. For the last two months there has been an endorsement of a political party in Pennsylvania. There were protests from locals; the endorsement was repeated, the rival party was assailed, and that has been going on and on. And I want to say, as an evidence that that thing was seen by everybody, that Del. McCabe came to me during the course of this convention, only last week, and patting me on the back with a familiarity not warranted by our acquaintance, I never having associated with him, said to me: "Did you read those articles roasting your party in the Miners' Magazine?" I said to him: "I have no party in the I. W. W., Mr. McCabe." He insisted, and said: "Those articles roast you; how did you like them?" My answer was that I liked it first rate, "I always like to see a foe hang himself." At any rate, McCabe had read the articles, and he is not a miner. Now, I should think the men that make the demand, the delegates of the Mining Department, would enforce it from their organ. Now, it is a fact, as we all know, that that Mining Department organ did publish an endorsement of one political party in the state of Pennsylvania; that thereupon there came a protest from locals; that the Miners' Magazine printed the protest and repeated its endorsement and then proceeded to assail the rival party; that since that time it has been assailing the rival party with denunciations in line with its original endorsement and its subsequent assault. That being the fact, what more natural than that we should condemn such actions? What would you think of an organization that comes here with four delegates, whose convention has ordered them, and no doubt approved it by a referendum—ordered that this body shall not endorse any political party—what would you think of the representatives of such an organization if they come with such a proposition and they are blind to the fact that the organ of their own department is sinning against that very proposition? I say that such conduct would throw suspicion upon

the action of the delegate or delegates who should stand for that. We know that is done. And it is not a case of roasting. If I had come to this convention for roasting, other people would have been roasted. I have almost a satchelful of letters and affidavits that have come to me from the West, from members of the Western Federation of Miners, giving facts that might be used as an excuse for roasting. I am not here for revenge. I am here to endeavor to establish a principle, and when that principle is sinned against I am here to illustrate the principle by the sin. I am here, to use an expression from "The Mikado," to fit the punishment to the sin, and since the sin enables us to emphasize the principle, it is proper to mention the sin. If it were a roasting, if such action were done by some union, some trade union of metal workers, transportation workers or butcher workers; that may be said to be rather far-fetched, although that even would not be far-fetched; but when the sinning is done by the very organ of the very department that comes in with this thing, it is not only legitimate, it is not only proper, it is wise, it is necessary; because this body, as the Preamble, as this article says, has general supervision over all the membership. While respecting and admiring the attitude of the Mining Department in proposing the resolutions which are brought here, I for one cannot admire the action of the departmental officials who with one hand propose a certain thing and with the other hand are patting on the back the man who is sinning against it.

DEL. DUNCAN: I seconded Bro. McMullen's motion to strike this criticism of the "Miners' Magazine" out of the committee's report. The reason I did that was that I don't think it would be the proper thing to put in the constitution. This is the Constitutional Committee that is reporting, and if I understand it rightly, in adopting their report we make it a part of our constitution.

DELEGATES: No, no.

DEL. DUNCAN: Well, it would be accepting this in a way that I do not think is just right anyway. I think we could do better. At the same time, although I did second this motion, I know that what is said about the "Miners' Magazine" is perfectly true, that they have endorsed a political party and filled a large part of their editorial space with political literature, which is contrary to the purposes of this organization and ought not to be tolerated in any department whatever. And I therefore move as an amendment to the amendment that we concur in the recommendation of the Mining Department and incorporate the non-political-affiliation clause in the Preamble, and also that we instruct the General Executive Board to take proceedings—the incoming General Executive Board to proceed against the "Miners' Magazine" for their violation of our constitution, and to see to it that that publication comes to time.

DEL. PETKIELLA: I would like a point of information. I would like to know if there is anything in this resolution that is entirely in line with the resolution that we passed this morning when we did not concur in the recommendation of the Committee on Education and Literature. If such is the case I think to adopt the report of the committee would be contrary to what we have done this morning.

DEL. SIMS: I would like to ask a question. In condemning the official organ of the Western Federation of Miners, which is a part of the Industrial Workers of the World, through our constitution, is it not a fact that a law may be laid down in the constitution by which journals representing departments of this organization should be held in check when it comes to a question of endorsing political parties? I can't see why this condemnation couldn't also come in the consti-



tution just as well. Now, there will be other departments established in this organization and possibly journals, and if there is not some law provided for by this convention where such restrictions can be placed upon these journals they will in future perpetrate the same thing that has been condemned by the Western Federation of Miners. Now, I am surprised to see delegates here who come here instructed to say a thing, and get up on the floor and denounce the very thing that they are instructed to do, and I hold that the constitution of the Industrial Workers of the World should be so clear on that proposition that there would be no reason to doubt on the part of any editor who may become—any journal that may become a part of the department of this organization. I hold that it ought to be clear, absolutely clear, that they ought to see it and know that they must not commit an infraction so far as to the extent of endorsing a political party. If we are going to condemn that let us condemn that in the constitution so that it will be a written law handed down through the convention, and if the next ensuing convention sees fit to change it let it be up to them, but this convention is now sitting in judgment on this proposition, and I think it is up to us to act on it.

**THE CHAIRMAN:** The vote occurs on the amendment to strike out the roast to the "Miners' Magazine" from the resolution.

**DEL. DUNCAN:** I think our constitution would be perfectly clear upon this subject if we should put that clause in the Preamble which is recommended now from the Mining Department. And I think that as far as condemning the wrong action goes it will be very puerile and unavailing unless we take some measures to stop it. That is why I proposed this amendment to the amendment to which I did not get a second. It seems to me this is a rather unrevolutionary bunch of revolutionists here.

**DEL. McMULLEN:** I offered the amendment and I would like to make a few remarks in closing, and that is this: Now, the "Miners' Magazine" is by this report of the Constitution Committee, this report of theirs, put on trial. I submit this to all fair-minded men, that when they condemn a man they should at least prefer the evidence upon which they do, and not use a mere assertion that "I have seen this" or that "I failed to see it." I submit that we should read this here and then let men draw their own conclusions as to the facts of the accusations. I submit that any writer is entitled to a fair trial and to hear evidence and not mere assertion. Because my brothers on the other side of this question have asserted that O'Neill has printed these things is no proof, because what he prints is public property. They claim they have seen it, and having had access to it they should submit it and let us then judge of the question as to whether O'Neill did endorse—whether he, acting as editor, caused our official organ of the miners to endorse any political party or not. I say with all sincerity that I have not read anything in the "Miners' Magazine" endorsing any political party anywhere, and if it was in the state of Pennsylvania I most certainly would have seen such a proposition. Now, you know some of these things that are going around. I know why this is enacted. The remarks that are made there that score certain individuals in Pennsylvania are by no means an endorsement of their opinions in any sense. I think I know the article referred to, but I think there is a false interpretation put upon it, and I claim this, that until some evidence is produced and read here no man has a right to say that he has caused the "Miners' Magazine" to endorse any political organization. I claim that Bro. O'Neill is opposed to any such tactics; that he is thoroughly in accord with the idea that this

organization and the miners as a department will in no sense endorse any political party; thoroughly in accord with it. I believe he has acted in that spirit at all times. But I believe he claims the right to criticise any actions—public actions, understand me—of public men wherever located throughout the world, and I believe it is within the province of any newspaper. Now, I hope that this amendment to strike out will prevail.

(An interruption.)

DEL. McMULLEN: I claim at this time that I am closing the argument on the amendment of this proposition.

A DELEGATE: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have the floor.

DEL. McMULLEN: I certainly claim that. I asked it on that ground. I took the floor at this time to close the argument on this subject. I hope the brothers will strike out this reflection upon our official organ, as an uncalled for act upon the part of the committee wherein there was not one single word coming from the floor of this convention. Nowhere does it appear that that resolution was introduced from this convention and referred to them, but it is one that emanates from them and them alone. They want to reach out and get somebody. They have got something coming to them, and they are taking this means of using the official records of this organization to condemn a man that they don't have the courage of their convictions to stand on this floor and offer a resolution condemning him and referring specifically to his language in his official organ. It is a remarkable state of affairs, and I am surprised that a committee of this organization would descend to such methods. It is the first time it has appeared here, and I most heartily condemn it and hope this amendment to strike it from our records will prevail.

THE CHAIRMAN: The secretary will call the roll.

DEL. RYAN: Mr. Chairman, this is an affair that will not down. I will state that I am the conservator of the "Miners' Magazine." I have positive knowledge from reading it. In the issue of June 6th of the "Miners' Magazine" it endorses the Socialist party of Pennsylvania by endorsing the candidates that were chosen at the convention.

DEL. McMULLEN: Have you got a copy of that article?

DEL. RYAN: I didn't imagine for a moment that any delegate from the Western Federation of Miners would on this floor admit that he did not read his own official organ.

DEL. McMULLEN: Will the brother pardon me for saying that until he produces the evidence I must infer that it exists in his imagination?

DEL. RYAN: The delegate has been asking for fairness and impartially during all this convention; will he at this time be fair and impartial enough to me to give me an opportunity to get the document for him? I will have it this afternoon.

DEL. McMULLEN: Get it tomorrow morning.

DEL. RYAN: I want to state that I want to vote for this proposition that is brought in here. We have come with those instructions, and we would not try to repudiate the instructions of the convention, but I want to state that so far as the political attitude of the Western Federation of Miners is concerned it is expressed in the resolution passed in the last convention in Denver and which appeared in the "Butte Miner," a capitalist controlled paper in that neighborhood, which stated that the Industrial Workers of the World are trying to make everybody members of the Socialist Party, and that the organization itself would be nothing but the tail of the Socialist Party.

Accordingly, on their return to Butte a special committee was appointed to draw up a resolution which would set forth the political attitude of the Western Federation of Miners, and the resolution which they presented was unanimously adopted and they were instructed to send it to the organizations and also to take pains to see that it was published, and I will read a portion of the resolution that was adopted:

"As to the charge that the Western Federation of Miners has passed into the control of the Socialist party, this we emphatically deny. As a department of the mining industry of the Industrial Workers of the World, its mission is a purely economic one. As an integral part of the central organization known as the Industrial Workers of the World it proposes to organize all of the workers in the mining industry into a single organization acting together with the workers similarly organized in other departments of industry to take and hold that which they produce by their labor, through an economic organization of the working class without affiliation with any political party. The attitude of the Western Federation of Miners towards political action is that it is simply the expression of the mental intelligence and economic condition of the working class, but the one is a reflection of the other, and their division on the industrial field necessarily implies division on the political field."

DEL. RYAN: That was supposed to be an official declaration of the "Miners' Magazine" as far as the party was concerned.

DEL. McMULLEN: What page is that, Ryan?

DEL. RYAN: 212. Now we find the "Miners' Magazine," without any question—we have the proof—it endorsed the socialist party. I say that is in violation of our principles as enunciated here in this resolution. It is in violation of the spirit of the last convention which sent us here with particular instructions to say that this convention should adopt and ask to be submitted to a referendum a declaration that we ask the endorsement of no political party whatsoever. I think the position of the "Miners' Magazine" was not correct, but I also claim that this is not the proper time to try the "Miners' Magazine." Now, this morning after full discussion we passed a resolution that emanated from the Committee on Resolutions, and we find by the unanimous action of this convention we decided to instruct Local 125 in Denver to withdraw its endorsement of William D. Haywood for the similar reason that he was a candidate of the Socialist party. I think the proper way to settle this thing would be, and I offer as a substitute, Mr. Chairman, that we adopt the report of the committee except that portion which refers to the "Miners' Magazine;" that that be referred to the Committee on Education and that they be instructed to bring in a resolution to this convention covering that portion. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It is moved as a substitute for the matter pending before the house that we adopt the resolution of the committee except that portion referring to the "Miners' Magazine," and that that part be referred to the Committee on Education and Literature with instructions that that committee bring in a resolution covering the subject.

(Question called for.)

DELEGATES: Unanimous.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question?

DELEGATES: No objection.

THE CHAIRMAN: The secretary will call the roll.

DEL. McMULLEN: There is no objection on my part to that, Mr. President.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection on the part of any delegate to unanimous consent?

DEL. KLEESE: One.

THE CHAIRMAN: Del. Kleese. Any others? If not the Chair will rule that it is carried with one vote in the negative, Del. Kleese voting in the negative.

### STRUCTURE OF ORGANIZATION.

Report of Committee on Constitution continued:

DEL. KINNEALLY: "We recommend the insertion of the following after the word "welfare" in Article I, Section 2, paragraph A, and the striking out of all the provisions on Page 5 of the constitution:

"The Industrial Workers of the World shall be composed of actual wage workers brought together in an organization embodying thirteen industrial departments, industrial unions, local industrial unions, local recruiting unions, industrial councils and individual members.

"Individual members shall be those actual wage workers who in isolated positions desire to attach themselves to the Industrial Workers of the World until such time as a body of this organization to which they are eligible shall be organized in their locality.

"Local recruiting unions shall be composed of actual wage workers in whose respective industries in a given locality there does not exist during their membership a local industrial union.

"Local industrial unions shall be composed of all the actual wage workers in a given industry in a given locality, welded together in trade or shop branches or as the particular requirements of said industry may render necessary.

"An industrial union shall be comprised of the local industrial unions of the various localities in America, in a given industry.

"An industrial department shall be made up of the industrial unions of closely kindred industries appropriate for representation in the departmental administration, and assigned thereto by the General Executive Board of the I. W. W.

"Industrial councils for the purpose of establishing general solidarity in a given district may be organized, and shall be composed of delegates from not less than five local industrial or local recruiting unions, and shall maintain communication between said district and general headquarters.

"The departments shall be designated as follows:"

DEL. KINNEALLY: Then follows the rest of the paragraph.

DEL. FISCHER: I move that it be adopted. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It is moved and seconded that the report of the Committee on Constitution on this matter be adopted. You have heard the motion; are you ready for the question?

DEL. RYAN: I would like to ask a few questions. Is there any provision in there for anything similar to a state organization in what you have read?

DEL. KINNEALLY: No, that will come up later on with reference to what we recommend. There is nothing in this at the present time, no. That will have to be attended to later on.

DEL. FRENCH: Where it says "Industrial councils may be formed in a given district" does not cover the case which I assume Delegate Ryan has in mind.

DEL. McMULLEN: I would like to ask the Secretary a question—

DEL. KINNEALLY: Let me read that again: "Industrial councils for the purpose of establishing general solidarity in a given dis-

trict may be organized, and shall be composed of delegates from not less than five local industrial or local recruiting unions, and shall maintain communication between said district and general headquarters."

DEL. McMULLEN: Mr. President, just what part there of Article I, do you begin from? From "B" at the top of page 5?

DEL. KINNEALLY: This will be inserted in Article I, Section 2, after paragraph A, Section 2, after the word "welfare."

DEL. McMULLEN: It strikes this all out. Well, do you make somewhere else provision as to the formation of these executive boards of the departments as they are in there in Section 3 on page 5? That is all stricken out, as I understand by this report, is it not? Now, is there some provision for that in some other part of the Constitution Committee's report?

DEL. KINNEALLY: There is for the formation of departments.

DEL. McMULLEN: Because, you come down to Section 4 of the same article and pick out the words "industrial council," and then you qualify again that industrial councils shall be composed of industrial Unions. Now, as I take it from the interpretation placed upon the word "industrial unions" here, in Butte we would not have a single industrial union. We could have one union where the miners, engineers, smeltermen, teamsters and working men could act together, and they could be called an industrial union; but from the terms of this proposition here it would exclude the laundry workers and all the others that go to make up a part of the industries of the mining department—because miners have to have clothes washed just the same as anybody else; that is one of their peculiarities. Therefore we never could qualify in Butte for an industrial council. You would have to have five or six industrial unions to make an industrial council. And still we have an organization in the same part of the country of a similar nature, and it has a matter of thirty or forty unions in it. While I am not criticising that spirit, I want to know what you are doing with Section 3. If we clearly understand that you are striking it out I will know where you are at.

DEL. KINNEALLY: It is stricken out.

DEL. McMULLEN: Well, is there any other place in your report that you propose to substitute that?

DEL. KINNEALLY: Not that I know of at the present time.

DEL. McMULLEN: Well, now, brothers, I cannot conscientiously vote for this change because I do believe that the departments—that there should be some qualification as to how they shall be created; and that covers the entire thing, how they shall be created and organized.

DEL. KINNEALLY: We, the committee, will assure you that the departments will be taken care of at the next meeting of the committee.

DEL. McMULLEN: Would you object to having this matter referred back to you, and you take this whole thing and consider that matter?

DEL. KINNEALLY: No, only that part.

DEL. McMULLEN: Then I cannot vote for it as it stands.

DEL. KLEESE: Then vote against it.

DEL. HALL: Mr. Chairman, that part of the committee's report which relates to industrial councils, it seems to me is somewhat vague. If it means exactly what it says, that five or more industrial unions shall form a council confined to a certain district, it seems to me that there is a phase of that proposition which should be discussed. For instance, it seems to me that every proposition in an industrial organi-

zation which tends towards keeping up or referring in any sense to geographical lines is a dangerous proposition. It seems to me that since an industrial union—that is that part of the industrial union, the function of an industrial union which confines itself to geographical lines, is not only dangerous to the industrial union movement as a whole, but is absolutely of no service to the working class—absolutely of no service to the working class. Now, there are a few dangers that I could point out to you. One of the pronouncements of our organization is that we shall not affiliate with any political party. Yet the activities of a district council, the activities of an association of locals within a certain geographical limit, must to a certain extent influence us in a political direction. That is, the activity of a district council is not economic. There is no economic activity which they can play but what could be played by the locals without the district council being chartered. Now, it seems to me that if those district councils are necessary for the purpose of consultation and for delegates and locals to get closer together, that it might be accomplished without chartering them. It seems to me that if there is any function that a district council can play, it can play it without a charter. Now, the moment you charter them and legalize them you establish the idea of geographical lines; you prescribe it according to certain geographical lines; and for that reason there is a certain activity which accompanies that proposition which is political, and the working class cannot avoid political influence under these conditions. Now, it seems to me that the mission of the Industrial Workers of the World is economic, and that every proposition of whatever kind that tends towards political influence is a dangerous proposition. I claim that were it not for our geographical lines in the United States to-day, the difficulty of the working class in freeing themselves would not be so great. I claim that one of the first victories that the working class must win is the destruction of geographical lines, and that is my objection to the working class confining themselves to political action or bearing on political action for their emancipation. For that reason it seems to me that to be perfectly consistent in a revolutionary idea the industrial union must destroy political lines and absolutely refuse to recognize them in any sense. It seems to me that there is no point within the United States but what every part of the industrial union radiates. We have no geographical lines. Now, I say if it is necessary to establish these district councils, let us do so without issuing a charter to them, but let us simply give those locals permission to come together and discuss such matters as they wish to discuss, without chartering them. Now, I do not refer to the branches of an industrial union within a district, but I simply refer to the council which you claim is made up of mixed unions and locals of the different industries acting together in industrial councils. I cannot see a very high purpose that they can serve. I can see many dangers that might creep in there provided this institution is chartered.

DEL. FISCHER: I hold that the theory of district councils is not circumscribed by political lines. A county, a state, could possibly be classed as political territories. Now, you deny these lines, and I hold that Delegate Hall in his argument denies that he lives in a certain place. We cannot get out of that. You live in Chicago. I live in New York. It is a certain locality; we cannot deny that fact, cannot get out of it. But we can get out of it if you live in Cook County and I live in New York County. We can get out of them, we don't need them, but we must have a certain locality. That certain locality may

have a radius of fifty miles, or may have a radius of twenty-five miles, to suit our own purposes. The purpose of the industrial council is to get the different industries represented in a certain locality closer together; just as the general administration of the I. W. W., representing the government of the whole United States or any other given country in the same sense that a district council does the government for a certain locality, the administration of that certain locality. For that reason I believe that the district council as defined in the constitution, or the definition of district council in the constitution, is absolutely correct.

DEL. FRENCH: I am not going to take up the question whether we should theorize on anything outside of the actual facts that we have to legislate on, but owing to the objection of Delegate McMullen to the whole of page 5 being stricken out, I would move that the committee's report be accepted with this amendment: That Section 3, as it will be properly worded, owing to the previous amendments made—that Section 3 remain intact and that the report be accepted as it is with Section 3 remaining intact. Are you satisfied?

DEL. McMULLEN: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: I did not hear any second to that.

DEL. MOORE: I second it.

DEL. RICHTER: There is another phase, if I understand the question—

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded that the report of the committee be accepted with the addition of Section 3 as it now stands; that Section 3 remains intact. You have heard the amendment.

DEL. RICHTER: I have nothing to say on the amendment. I wanted to speak to the original motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: You can speak to the original motion on the amendment.

DEL. RICHTER: From the reading of the committee's report it states that there shall be an industrial council composed of at least five industrial unions. It seems to me we will be confronted with a condition that we have not an industrial union—

DEL. FRENCH: A point of order. He didn't say it just right. It says five industrial locals or local recruiting unions.

DEL. RICHTER: That is just the point I want to bring out. Now, we may have one branch of an industry organized, but under the terms of the recommendation or clause of the Constitution Committee it would prevent them organizing the same into a district council until the whole industry was organized. Consequently the objection raised by Delegate McMullen is a correct one. It seems to me, especially at this time, that some provision ought to be made that it be possible to organize a district council with trades or branches of industrial unions to form a district council, which, with the interpretation as it reads now, would not be possible. Consequently they may have several organizations, more than five, but could not form this industrial council according to the wording of the report of the Constitution Committee.

DEL. FISCHER: I believe Delegate Richter is absolutely wrong in his statement here. When he says if there is a branch of an industry organized, that is a definition of industrial council that is altogether wrong. Now, I hold that when we proceed to organize in a certain locality, that the first organization, even if it is only a part of that industry, will be designated as a branch of the district industrial organi-

zation; therefore, it will be represented, no matter whether it is a branch or not; it is an industry which through that branch will be represented.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: And all other branches?

DEL. FISCHER: And all other branches afterwards, too.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any further remarks?

DEL. RYAN: I would like to ask about a resolution that was referred last Saturday to the Committee on Constitution, which, in my judgment, properly belongs in that amendment that is now being considered here. I want to ask, through the Chair, the secretary of that committee if he can assure me that action on the proposed amendment here now does not in any way exclude consideration of my matter when it comes up?

THE CHAIRMAN: In the opinion of the Chair it does not.

DEL. KINNEALLY: No.

DEL. RYAN: All right.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection to the adoption of the report of the Committee on Constitution on this section as amended?

DEL. McMULLEN: I am not going to accept the amendment, I do not like the form of that part there referring to the councils; it is so vague. Anyway it never would apply in our country.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Delegate McMullen, isn't your council in Butte, Montana, composed of American federations and other unions?

DEL. McMULLEN: Exactly the same thing, yes.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: It is not an industrial council.

DEL. McMULLEN: I don't claim it is an industrial council, but I claim this, that with the construction placed upon it by the Secretary-Treasurer it would be impossible ever to create an industrial council.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: In Butte?

DEL. McMULLEN: In Butte. We never could create one.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Oh, yes.

DEL. McMULLEN: Because the mining industry really is the whole proposition. The others are all adjuncts.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: According to the understanding that I have received from the remarks made on this floor you could, because every branch of the mining industry could have a separate branch of the mining industry, and every branch could be represented in the industrial council.

DEL. McMULLEN: You see, we have really but one branch of mining, and that is, of course, the mineral.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: That is true, but you have branches of engineers employed in the mines, you have the milling and smeltermen's union, you have helpers and different branches in the industry. Isn't that correct?

DEL. McMULLEN: Yes.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: They can be represented in the district council.

DEL. McMULLEN: If you are going to close out all the unions that now stand as recruiting unions for the industrial union as laid down here, for the purpose of disrupting the present unions to create an industrial union we would like to know it and we would meet that argument.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: That is not the object.

DEL. McMULLEN: We have unions organized on craft lines and miners in various lines of work as members in one union. The smeltermen, with engineers and firemen, are all in the smeltermen's union. The engineers, firemen and dump men are all in the union.



SEC. TRAUTMANN: Correct.

DEL. McMULLEN: Yet they won't accept any other workers in the engineers' union but engineers and firemen. You see there are many phases of this proposition. We are an old established union. Some of our unions are fifteen years of age and more. In fact, the miners' union of Butte, the father of this organization—distinctly understand me—is 27 or 28 years of age. I want to emphasize that, that that is the father of the organization. I see a smile permeates the countenances of several of our delegates.

A DELEGATE: It is a pretty young father.

DEL. McMULLEN: Yes, it is 27 years of age. It is the father of this movement. Now, here comes this younger one, and it desires to split it up.

A DELEGATE: It is too bad.

DEL. McMULLEN: I can, of course, understand the idea of splitting up a treasury of \$175,000, but I can't stand the idea of splitting up the union.

DEL. SCHWEINBURG: I think brother McMullen goes around the bush and don't want to come out. It is clearly understood here that any local union in any industry can be organized, but what we understand by district councils or industrial councils, as you call them, is that these local unions shall form a council where the delegates shall come to deliberate on matters concerning the whole of the community or locality. It is not to say that you ought to give them a smeltermen's local union and take in firemen and heavers and such trades. That is not stated here. You can stay where you are in your industry. But you shall bring all the locals together in a district council or industrial council where the delegates from the various locals can come together to take action on matters concerning the whole of their locality. That is what I understand the district council will be as brother Kinneally mentioned. Brother McMullen said that his local union is 28 years old. I can tell you that my local union is 28 years old, just as well as his, and we have got members in my local union who have been paying dues in that local union 26 years. He claimed that it was the parent of the so-called United Metal Workers.

DEL. McMULLEN: I do.

DEL. SCHWEINBURG: Of the old United Metal Workers. That is all.

THE CHAIRMAN: Call the roll.

The roll was partly called, to McMullen.

DEL. McMULLEN: I am not clear on the terms of that thing. I could not conscientiously vote for a proposition that I do not clearly understand, and therefore have to vote no. I know what I have got; I am not going to jump off onto something that I don't know anything about.

The roll was continued, to McKinnon.

DEL. McKINNON: Mr. Chairman, I was out. What is the question?

SEC. TRAUTMANN: The question before the house is, voting on the report of the Constitution Committee relative to giving a definition of different parts of the organization.

DEL. McKINNON: That is a very indefinite answer. I cannot vote.

The roll call was completed and resulted: Total vote, 444; Yes, 331; No, 113.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is carried. The Secretary will proceed.

## THE LABEL.

Report of Committee on Constitution continued:

DEL. KINNEALLY: The committee has had presented to it several recommendations and amendments for the abolishment of the label. We came to this conclusion and offer this resolution:

"Resolved, That Section 10, Article VI, shall be repealed in so far as it affects the label, and that the label be hereby abolished."

DEL. McKINNON: I move the adoption of the resolution. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been regularly moved and seconded that the report of the Constitution Committee on this matter be adopted. You have heard the motion; are you ready for the question?

DEL. GOLDBERG: Mr. Chairman, I object. The label question at the present time, Mr. Chairman and fellow delegates, is a strong factor to hold the body together. The A. F. of L. forces men, forces I. W. W. men and those men who are engaged in the given lines of industry into submission by means of the label, giving possession of it to the manufacturer, giving them the label, and those manufacturers retain it and their shops are organized and the men forced to join the A. F. of L. Now, when we organize the working class on class conscious lines and we obtain the power in the United States we can adopt the label temporarily to try and help along the rank and file of the I. W. W. movement and take away the strength from the fakirs on the other hand. Therefore, I urge the delegates to this convention to take that question under consideration. I am not in a position to take up your time with a speech, but I think that the miscellaneous trades are interested in that label question at the present time, just as I myself.

DEL. DUNCAN: Brother Chairman, I think that we ought to think seriously on this proposition and consider it carefully before taking a step to abolish this label at our present stage of development. We are still in the propaganda stage. Any advertising that can come to us will certainly do us some good. The label has done a great deal for us. I know that some harm has come from it, even this far. But if we can by another course of action abolish the evil, in another way, and still retain the good effects of the label, why should we not continue its use? In the city of Portland I know that the label did a great deal for industrial unionism. You can go into the restaurants there and see it on the bills. You can see the label spread over a great many different places around town, and the proletariat of that city and a great many other cities have certainly become interested in industrial unionism through that source. The fact of the label being universal and of a uniform color and design appeals to the eye of a great many ignorant working men who would perhaps not stop long enough to read a book. A printed page looks dry and uninteresting, but a label is attractive. They will read a few letters on it; they can understand a little of it. After they get a little interest aroused they will probably read something more. And as for the evil effects of the label, such as the advertising of capitalist goods that we do not want to advertise and the muddling of the minds of the working class as to what work was done by our men and what was not, can't we come at that in some other way? It seems to me if we print an inscription under the label every time it is printed on goods as an evidence of work done by our men, and state in that inscription what that label signifies, that is, state just what the work done is, and how much and the member of the union whose men performed the work and all about it, anything regarding it—that we can clear this proposition up a great deal. The label as it has been printed in the past year

has been indefinite. We have seen it printed on cigar boxes. Now, we do not even know from the printing of that label on the cigar box as to whether all of the work of making the cigars in the box was done by I. W. W. men or not; and thereby we do not know whether the paper around the box was printed by I. W. W. printers or not; and we do not know whether the wood was fashioned by I. W. W. box makers into a box or not; and we do not know whether the nails that are driven into the box were produced in an I. W. W. nail factory or not. But if we do print an inscription under the label, stating just how much work and the nature of it, every time we see that label it will mean something to us, or at least the inscription will. Of course, the inscription will become the important part, but the label is a good advertisement and we can just as well leave it there as to take it off. I am against this proposition, however.

DEL. HOLMES: I agree with brother Duncan, and in pursuance of the ideas of the organization that I represent I think it is not the time at present to abolish the label. Now, I maintain that that label is the most effective way of fighting the A. F. of L. It does not matter what anybody says about it, the A. F. of L. is a great stumbling block in the road of the working class to-day, and the labor fakir, I really believe, is a worse enemy to the toilers than any capitalist or capitalist representative outside of the labor ranks, on the face of the earth. I would like to know what is the most effective way of downing the A. F. of L. They have a multiplicity of labels. They have a lot of craft labels which embody perfectly their craft form of organization and their ideas. We adopt a universal label which stands for the working class as a whole, irrespective of crafts, and drawing them into one solid body. Now, this argument against the label is this, that it suits the capitalist class to advertise their goods; that it is sold to them, or has been sold to them, and that it is really a capitalist proposition. Now, then, that is perfectly true as regards the A. F. of L. label. It does not follow or it should not follow that it is true in regard to the single universal label of the I. W. W. It should not follow at all. Because a thing has been prostituted at one time and false in a different form, it does not follow that it is going to continue to be used in that form. We might as well say why does a political party have an emblem or label? It does not serve to prostitute a political party. This label to-day, I maintain, is necessary. It does not mean that the capitalist class wants it, although we know that if the I. W. W. was strong enough they would want that label because they would have to have it in order to sell their goods. Even allowing that they do that, the men who will look for the I. W. W. label will do that to support the revolutionary working class and to down the A. F. of L. label. That is the way I look at it, and I think that that is the only logical way to look at it. We must remember that we are living under the capitalist system, and we are compelled to work for some boss, whether we like it or not, that is a settled fact. Now in the course of time when we get strong enough the capitalists will want our label, and certainly no capitalist will be able to get it, and we will be able to do things. But to-day we are in the propaganda stage. In the face of the fact of the American Federation of Labor, we went to work without a multiplicity of labels and established one universal label, and from that you can go on to the time when you will abolish all labels and all emblems whatsoever.

DEL. MOORE: I rise to speak against the label, for the abolishment of it. It is another one of those paper propositions for getting out of wage slavery. The label has done the Industrial Workers of

the World a great deal more harm than it has good. For instance, in the city of Chicago we started off with a fairly good-sized Cigarmakers' Local. It is a great deal smaller now. Why? Because a man who sees a chance for a demand for the goods could go out and start a cigar shop of his own. We have here in this hall—I guess he is here—a man that has been making a living off of the label, and I got it from him personally. What is the difference in his position with the red label Buckeye and with the blue label Buckeye? The book trust, the coal trust, the clothing trust or any other trust never had any use for any label. When you keep the label you are just simply making it possible for the wage earner to go into business as a Buckeye. I name the printing trade; the printing trade we absolutely cannot build up until you abolish the label. What use is it to Donnelly? What use is it to all these big shops here that are now out of the Typographical Union? How can we get if those shops on the label proposition after that strike is called off, and organize them? You take the "Industrial Worker," for instance, that is printed in Joliet. They have a label on it, but there is no number of the shop. Why? Because it is a craft shop that stands between us and organizing that shop. If that was a non-union shop, if that was any one of these big shops that have no use for the label, then you could go into that big shop and organize those men on the basis of industrial unionism. But there you play right into the craft union hands. The medium-sized shops are craft union shops, but the big shops are independent. Now, if that in Joliet was not a craft shop; if it was printed where it could be printed the cheapest, regardless of the label, then you could go to the big shops and you could organize those shops on the basis of industrial unionism. We will never get out of wage slavery with any bogus thing like this universal label. It may be all right for an emblem, but when you adopt that label you repudiate the claim that there is nothing in a common standard, and you play right into the hands of the enemy.

DEL. RYAN: After listening to the discussion I am somewhat in favor of the case made by Del. Holmes. I agree with him that we have to have something at the present time, even though we might leave ourselves open to the accusation of using capitalist methods. Our deposed or ex-president, Charles O. Sherman, told me last June in Denver that up to that time there had been seventy-seven strikes among the locals of the Industrial Workers of the World and that they had won every strike. That impressed me very favorably. I have read his printed speeches and I have heard him say himself at the Coliseum Hall in Denver that the red label was a guaranty at all times that the product on which it was put was of a factory that was unionized along industrial lines from cellar to garret. I find that there is absolutely no truth in the statement. And I agree with the delegate who has said here that there is no difference between the red label Buckeye and the blue label Buckeye, because I find that it is used by the Buckeyes to exploit the Buckeye employees. At the same time I would like to call attention to a little matter that has been uppermost in my mind since the discussion arose. I know cigarmakers, one in particular, who was a member of the A. F. of L. Cigarmakers' International Union over 22 years. He has been at all times a consistent revolutionist not only in talk but in action. He has actually been knocked out of business because he has spread the doctrines that we have advocated on this floor. The moment the Industrial Workers of the World came into existence he got the red label. There are hundreds like him at the present time who cannot, and

in fact, will not go back in the American Federation of Labor on account of its policy of craft unionism during all the years it has existed. I want to say for the individual working man that I have come in contact with, that they have a prejudice against the label; they don't care and they will not purchase goods with the union label on them. They have not been educated to the point where they can realize the difference. In fact, the majority of union men that I know would rather smoke cabbage with a union label on it than smoke a clear Havana without a label on it. Now, so far as the label itself is concerned, I cannot see how any delegate on this floor has any use for it. I know our general executive board officers have no use for it because I never see the red label cigar where I buy my cigars, and that is a fact. Now, as I already stated, I have to concede that I agree with delegate Holmes, and we put ourselves in a rather peculiar position at this time if we vote to abolish the label altogether, because in the last part to be adopted in the recommendation of the committee they recommend that the label be only issued to houses which are fully organized along the lines of industrial unionism. That is what I favor, and I offer that as an amendment to the pending motion.

DEL. MOSKOVITZ: There has been so much said about this label, and the side that was opposing the label has brought in an argument stating—with which I also agree—that the label has become a weapon in the hands of the capitalist class, and that that label is only used for profit by the capitalist class that manufactures all these things. The comrades remind me of an argument that I want to present, that many a man abuses a glass of beer or a glass of wine, and that because a certain man gets drunk, therefore, a glass of wine is no good. I say, if the man does not take too much and get sick that the glass of beer is all right. But if you take too much or too often of it, the beer is not to be blamed because a man uses it to such an extent. Now the label under the conditions in which we are placed at the present time will not do us any good, but if it serves only as an emblem of this organization to bring it before the public and before the working class of this country, in itself will serve the purpose of this organization. I admit that the label cannot do us much good as far as the manufacturing end of it is concerned, but as an emblem for this organization it is a good emblem and we ought to preserve it.

DEL. TULLAR: Mr. Chairman, about two minutes—

DEL. LINGENFELTER: Mr. Chairman and fellow delegates, I am a cigar maker of long years membership in the Cigarmakers' International Union, based on years of experience. Those of you that have weighed the label question carefully cannot help but recognize the fact that it certainly is a capitalist instrument. I am going to try to place it in as clear a manner as possible. The label is put out and used by the manufacturer with the aid of the members of the labor organization for the purpose of advertising the goods of that manufacturer against the goods of others that do not use it. Now, let us see how it works. Take the cigar industry as a whole. Read the advertisements of the International Union—and they tell you that the label is used by 20,000 factories with 48,000 members, being a little more than two men to the shop. I would take that to be so, that they are telling the truth, and that in this age of concentrated industry the so-called trust represents more than 20,000 cigar makers alone. We are a tributary as wage slaves to the factories of all classes engaged in the manufacture of cigars. Upon the other hand you have the little factories, the Buckeyes. These large manufacturers go to the market and buy up first, second, third and sometimes

## SECOND CONVENTION PROCEEDINGS

the fourth grades of tobacco. They manufacture the tobacco into cigars, cigarettes and so on. They place them on the market. In what condition is the Buckeye? The Buckeye has to go into the market and, as every well grounded wage-earner knows, the price of the cheap grades of tobacco rises higher and higher, and as a result of that this Buckeye has to buy that cheap grade of tobacco and put it on the market at a very high price, and he expects to do it at the expense of the label, with the enormous high expense of advertisements, running sometimes as high as thousands a year. Now, we of the Industrial Workers of the World are opposed by the cigarmakers in the American Federation of Labor. They debar absolutely all members of industrial organizations from the cigarmakers' shops, but while they bar out the workers in one part they take them in in another. Why? Simply because their boss demands it. They permit some manufacturer in Pennsylvania to make cigars at \$6 a thousand, while they are \$12 and \$14 in another district. That is what this red label would do. It is no better than the blue label; it is a fraud.

DEL. TULLAR: I just want to talk about two minutes to explain my position on this label question as per my findings as an organizer. I will agree with every statement that has been made upon this floor today that no matter how you figure it out, a trade label of any kind is a capitalistic label. But I think you will also bear me out that it is absolutely impossible to teach a child algebra until it has learned common arithmetic. And for about twenty years the child of labor has been taught that unless a certain thing has got the label on it it is a scab article. When you go out in the field and try to educate that child in the principles of the algebra of the labor question, you will have to knock out of his head the old system of algebra before you can get him to understand the primary principles of this question. Hence, for our development for a short time only I am in favor of this label, because it enables us to advertise in one sense, and on the other hand it enables us to meet those in the A. F. of L. that are constantly trying to arouse the working class against us.

DEL. STIMS: I want to say that I have had some experience concerning this label proposition myself, being in the field as an organizer. I recognize this fact, and I have come to find it to be a fact, that the label in its every sense is practically a badge of slavery and a magnetic influence to attract the petty bourgeois, or cockroaches as you may call them, to this organization for the express purpose of getting the use of that label. That label is a good weapon in the hands of the employer. It has ever been so, and that has been the meaning of that label. It is practically an asset of the employer. There is one delegate that got up and spoke about the label and took as the premises that he started from that we were here discussing practical ways, and he got up and discussed a crocodile. He got up to speak about the blue label as an educational feature, and he began to tell us about whiskey and beer. This delegate over here begins to tell us about teaching the child algebra when he should learn his alphabet. Now, that all seems pretty good for talking, but how are you going to teach the child if you don't teach him correctly? If the child is falling and you want to teach him to walk, are you going to teach the child to walk forward or are you going to teach the child to walk backward? If you teach the child to walk forward the child will walk forward and not backward, and that would be all the child would know. Now, the label in its every sense, I hold, is a detriment to the wage-working class, and all who have been talking along the lines of recognizing that label as a benefit to the wage-earning class are young babes and have been talking along the wrong lines. But

the crust will have to be broken sooner or later. In introducing this organization, which is the expression of the embryonic structure of our future time, what are we to do? Are we to launch this organization along clear lines or are we to continue to teach this babe to walk backward, or are we to teach this babe to walk correctly? That is the question. Now, I hold that the label is a detriment, as I formerly said, to the wage-working class from three points of view. The first point is this, that the past form of organization, the craft organization as some of the speakers held, has been built up on that label proposition. We know that the old organization has been based upon false premises and must of necessity die, and that that label proposition has been one of the premises upon which this organization has been built up, and that is one of the premises that is the first to decay. The second point is this, if this organization wishes to be true to its principles, wishes to be true to its class interests, if we wish absolutely to stand up for the principles embodied in the preamble to the constitution where it says that there is no harmony of interest existing between the employer and employe, then we should recognize the fact that this policy which is a useless function in our organization should be wiped out because it educates the rank and file to believe in a proposition that keeps them chained absolutely to wage slavery, that keeps them chained to the employer, and that denies the principle that there is no unity or harmony of interest between the employer and employe. Thirdly, when the label-taking the label in its every respect—has been abolished, we who are now launching the Industrial Workers of the World need not lay any special stress upon the fight that is going to be brought upon us by the pure and simple organizations. If we cannot fight it on the label proposition we will fight it on something else, which you are doing right along. So we don't need to fear the fight that is going to be brought on us by the pure and simple organizations on account of the label proposition; not at all. That we don't have to give any consideration to at all. They are going to fight us any way. Hence I hold that as the label in the American Federation of Labor is a source of rottenness, for the love of heaven let us not imitate it, but cut out that cancer which is eating out the vitals of that organization and prevent it from getting into our organization. The sooner the label is abolished the quicker we can cure the disease and reach the rank and file of the wage slaves and teach them the true principles of the class struggle along the proper lines.

DEL. DUNCAN: I want to make an amendment.

DEL. GOLDBERG: Before any amendment is made I want to have the floor. I am heartily in favor—

THE CHAIRMAN: You can all have the floor.

DEL. DUNCAN: All right.

DEL. REID: Mr. Chairman and fellow delegates, we all know that the label is a repudiation of one of the tenets of this revolutionary organization, and that is that there is nothing in common between the capitalist class and the working class. If you give the label to the capitalist he takes it because it is to his material interest to take it, and not because he will give you anything in return. I might say it makes no difference to him whether the corporation is built up by the red label or the blue label. When it comes to a question of hitting us on the head he will use a club possibly with a red label on it, and it will hit just as hard. We know there are shoddy goods made for one class and fine goods for another, and both have the label. What does the label mean? It may be put on cigars that

come from cabbage, and I tell you there are brothers that smoke cigars that are made out of cabbage with the I. W. W. label on. The capitalist class are not going to take that label unless it is a question of their material interest, as I say, and I repeat that it makes no difference to us whether we built up their business with the red label or whether it is built up with the blue label. We as a revolutionary organization have nothing to do with labels. I deny that it advertises. I can say this, that if a man buys a suit of clothes of shoddy and they go to pieces in two weeks and the Industrial Workers of the World is on it, he will say, "Well, it must be a rotten institution that places its approval on such goods as these that I am compelled to wear." (Applause.) Therefore I say we should discard the label right now, on the ground that Delegate Sims has said, that we must start and educate the working class rightly. How can we do it if we postpone the day? I tell you this proposition has to be faced seriously and by serious men. The education is necessary for the working class, and the sooner you get at that education in industrialism the better it will be.

DEL. McDONALD: I don't understand a great deal about the red label, but there is one thing about it, and that is this: The red label or any other label should represent that the article or goods sold that bears the label is made in shops, in factories, etc., where the working class is employed under good conditions, well paid, in shops well ventilated. Now, that being the case, the label must mean that the men are honestly paid and honestly used as wage workers. But according to the statements and sentiments produced here we find that the label is used for some other purpose. Now, I would ask, in the name of common sense, why did this organization introduce the red label and register it in mostly all the states in this Union, and in the Dominion of Canada, and only register it for six or seven months, allowing the manufacturers to place millions on their shelves in stock and labelled with the red label, and here in about six months you abolish that label? There is something radically wrong about an organization that carries out such a policy as that. What will they say? In our own little city there is a dry goods merchant that has nothing in his store but red label goods. He will be boycotted by the manufacturers that use the blue label. He will be immediately boycotted. His goods are on the shelves unsold. Of course it is nothing to the working class whether those are sold or not sold, as far as that is concerned, but they will ask, "What kind of an organization have you got?" Now, it seems to me that if we are going to abolish it we should give them at least six months or a year. If we are not going to abolish it, why then, there must be something doing. I consider that action on the red label of the Industrial Workers of the World is like the rest of the actions of this convention since it has assembled together. If I were to say at this present time that this convention is practically controlled and run by demagogues and fakirs in a certain political movement you would jump on top of me, I suppose.

A DELEGATE: We would. (Laughter.)

DEL. McDONALD: Now, Mr. Chairman, I ain't saying that, but if you can infer from what I say that that is right or that the bunch—well, if the shoe fits you you can wear it. Now, I contend that a business organization should do business in a business-like manner, and I heard this label question discussed in the City of Denver for two or three hours at a time. The Western Federation of Miners in convention assembled endorsed it and instructed their delegates to go out and fight for the red label. We did so. We bought the goods. I have



got a shirt on my back with an Industrial Workers of the World label on it.

A DELEGATE: Take it off.

DEL. McDONALD: Now you are going to make me take that shirt off, after this. (Laughter.)

A DELEGATE: Keep your shirt on.

DEL. McDONALD: Mr. Chairman, that is about all I care to say.

THE CHAIRMAN: Your time is up.

DEL. McDONALD: That is about all I have got to say.

THE CHAIRMAN: The secretary will call the roll.

DEL. GOLDBERG: I ask as a special privilege—

DEL. DUNCAN: Are amendments out of order?

DEL. FOX: I think that is hardly right.

DEL. GOLDBERG: I demand the floor as a special privilege.

DEL. RYAN: There are several that desire to speak.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, all right, then I will get out of the Chair while it is being discussed, because I don't believe it is the province of the Chairman to get up and leave while some one is talking, and I want you to find some one who can keep this straight. Del. Duncan, will you take the Chair?

DEL. DUNCAN: I nominate Brother Mahoney. He has done a good job heretofore. (Seconded.)

DEL. MAHONEY: I am hardly able to be around, and I don't believe I ought to act. I thank the brother for the nomination, but I will state that I might not be able to be here in the morning.

(Delegate Duncan took the Chair.)

DEL. GOLDBERG: Mr. Chairman and Fellow Delegates: Some statements were made here against the label by a few of the delegates. I deny all those statements as not being taken from the right standpoint of view of the label. One delegate said it is because they want to have the advertisement, and therefore they wish to use the label. I claim the advertisement to be for the I. W. W. Another delegate, Brother Sims, made a statement that the A. F. of L. is dead already or is keeping on dying, and because of the fact that the A. F. of L. is dead we don't want to have any label. To Brother Sims I will answer that if he wants to be the pall-bearer of the A. F. of L. let him go ahead and do it, but before he comes over to the house at the funeral of the A. F. of L. his jaw will be punched. I will explain the situation with the label. It is this: It is not true that the manufacturer wants to have that label. No manufacturer or capitalist wants to have his working men organized either on the A. F. of L. plan or on the I. W. W. plan. He don't want to have it; he don't want to have the label. The label was misused by the A. F. of L., that is true; but nevertheless, when you consider the consuming side of commodities you must admit that the working class are the major part of the consumers of commodities, and if they go in a store or any place and demand that an article shall bear a certain emblem showing that it is made by organized labor, and especially of the organization of which he is a member, I certainly think it will be effective because it will be effective in that certain place or that certain industry which introduces that label, and they will be in a position to demand better conditions and better concessions—immediate concessions I mean. Now, there is another fact that should be considered. The cap-makers and also the garment workers have got a label.

DEL. MOTHERWELL: A point of order. His five minutes are long up.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Yes, I understand so, but the Chair has no watch. Some one will have to furnish me one.

DEL. MOTHERWELL: And he spoke twice on the subject.

DEL. GOLDBERG: He may sell goods with the label on, and they send out salesmen to sell goods bearing the label of the I. W. W. Now then, as soon as we abolish the label the garment workers and cap-makers will be thrown out of their jobs immediately. We should take this as a business proposition on one side and as a weapon against the A. F. of L. on the other side. It is not true, what Del. Sims stated. The A. F. of L. is alive. We must figure on that, but we must defy it.

DEL. RICHTER. Bro. Chairman and brother delegates, some of the delegates who kill time here do not seem to have come here to discuss questions that are evidently vital to the interests of the Industrial Workers of the World. By the position taken here by various delegates it is evident that the label cannot be left off, and we might as well just take the time now to see what there is to this label question, and when we vote upon it know as far as possible how to vote for the purpose of promoting the interests of the Industrial Workers of the World. My organization instructed me to vote for abolishing the label. When I came back from last year's convention some of the members of the International Cigarmakers' Union stated that the means that were used by their employers to hold them within the craft organization was the blue label, and they held that it was one of the means of oppression. But from the statements made heretofore favorable of the retaining of the label, or even for the abolishing of it, they have not pointed to the underlying factor which should be in the mind of every delegate here. We recognize as Industrial Workers of the World that our strength lies as producers; here is where we organize and force concessions; and that our strength as consumers is very limited. It is limited by the kind of goods that we produce, and that is confined to a small variety of articles, the difference being this, that naturally only those wage workers employed in those industries can be benefited by the use of the label, and the result is that they are privileged in comparison with the rest of the wage workers, and it develops a class feeling; it develops a condition in the labor movement which retains the very thing we are striving to abolish through the Industrial Workers of the World. It develops the craft feeling. We have men in our local in Detroit who have a peculiar position in regard to the red label. Its abolition will make it possible for those wage slaves in the large factories to be organized in the Industrial Workers of the World. As has been pointed out, the reason for the manufacturers, the small manufacturers, using the label, is that they have a means to counteract the greater productivity of the large concerns by giving them a privileged position in the market, and they are enabled to use inferior goods at a higher price at the cost of those portions of the wage workers that are not benefited and protected by the use of the label. Consequently the better conditions of those wage workers that are protected by the label are paid by those that have no such protection. In fostering and retaining it we only work into the hands of the pure and simple trade unions. I deny that any protection can be given. It is only added to confuse the situation. It becomes a question of red label or blue label instead of a question between the capitalist and the worker. What we are organized for is to get the full product of our labor, first by getting as much as possible and then coming out and producing the best goods at the smallest price. It is not a question of retaining the label.

DEL. MARKLEY: I will be very brief, and I want you to take notice simply to find out whether the red label can be applied to pro-

tection in truth or not. If we cannot apply it in truth as well as in fact so that we can stand behind our assertion, that assertion that we are a revolutionary organization, then we do not want it. Now, I hold a stogie in my hand. It is made by Pollock. Every one of Pollock's employes is a union man belonging to the Stogie Workers' League. Now then, this is tobacco. The fellow that plowed the ground for that tobacco was a scab. That is 25 per cent scab. The fellow that made the box is a scab. The fellow that prints the stuff that goes around the box is a scab; so that when you come to measure up the amount of scab in the tobacco with the union label on it, it is 95 per cent scab. (Laughter.) Now, we will have to apply a proper analysis to this, and by applying that analysis we can find that you cannot put any label on the wagon workers', nor the coal miners', nor the pig iron makers. It is all scab, no matter if they were all union from the mine to the furnace and to the finishing mill. You cannot use the label where it is within the realm of possibility of organized millions of men. And we find that this cry for the label emanates from the very same source in the I. W. W. that you find it emanating from in the old rotten cigarmakers' union. The rottenest cigars that you can smoke have the union's label on, and are we going to "go" the American Federation of Labor, with its lies and double-dealing, "one better" when we know for a fact right here and now that the label is rotten and that the demand for it is practically reactionary? Now, if Bro. McDonald over here took off his shirt and I saw the label, then I would believe he had a union label on his shirt. (Laughter.) I don't know of any garment workers' garment with a label. I know this much, that if the union label is on it it don't guarantee what he has. If it is a fact that it came from a good shop, with good wages paid in the shop and with good wage-slave conditions, is that sufficient for us to put a label on and put our approval on something that we want to destroy? We want to destroy wage slavery, and if we destroy wage slavery we don't want to put any such thing as a label on it. When we are free men we know it will be right then, but as long as there are wage masters in existence I for one will kick against giving to any employer what we call fair play, because he don't give me fair play. We find that the club that is used to break your heads in the hands of the policeman, the minion of capitalism, will have a blue or red label on it. The fact of the matter is that the executive head of this nation invented a club to break our heads. The label stands for what the name stands for, for everything that is crooked, and for the labor fakir.

DEL. FOX: I desire to state on this question that all the locals of Cincinnati are unanimous for abolishing the label, and desired me to present their wishes to the convention. A great many arguments that I would advance have already been touched upon, but one has been omitted, and I think the chief point why I think it should be abolished. It tends to foster labor fakirism among the organizers. An organizer, of course, always wants to show great results. He wants to show how good an organizer he is, and hence he uses all available means in order to build up organizations. When you have a label and an organization who are pledged to patronize that label, he goes down to the manufacturer in the neighborhood and says to that manufacturer, "We have a label here which all our organizations are pledged to patronize. We have 20,000 members in this neighborhood and it is to your interest to get their trade." The manufacturer will say, "Yes, how can I get it?" The answer of the organizer is that "You must get your men in our organization." Then the manufacturer calls his men before him and says to them, "I want to get this label. I

want to get the patronage of these 20,000 men. I want you to join that organization." Some may object, but he says to them, "If you are not in my interest you have got to get out of my employ. I want that label and you have got to get in that organization." And he drives them in it. I could cite many instances of this in the A. F. of L., instances where the employer himself has paid an initiation fee of \$500 in order to get the label and put it on his goods. That is one argument for the label. They say it strengthens the organization. That is the kind of material that it brings in in order to strengthen the organization. These men never attend union meetings, but are under the influence of the business agent, and the organizations tend to become reactionary and are kept from becoming progressive. The label is positively valueless to at least nine-tenths of the workers—to the teamsters, railroad men, coal miners, mineral miners, iron and steel men, carriage and wagon workers; you can enumerate modern trades one after another that cannot use the label, but they must patronize those goods that are foisted upon them for the benefit of a manufacturer whose employees are organized just exactly in the way I have stated.

DEL. PARKS: Mr. Chairman, I have got another argument, and that goes to the origin of labelism. My position is that for the reason the International Cigarmakers' Union have got a label or trade mark, so we have adopted one. That is about as far as this ordinary label talk goes. Now, the label business arose in the state of California. It is a fact that the Cigarmakers' International Union was the first organization to adopt a label, and it was adopted in the state of California. Anti-Chinese agitation was up, and the anti-Chinese agitation was an agitation that represented a conflict between two sets of capitalists on the Pacific coast; the American capitalists and the Chinese business men, who were going to supplant them in their undertakings; and they got the working men to unite and put a white label on the goods that were made, on the cigars, so as to distinguish them from cigars that were made in Chinese factories for a Chinese business man. It was there practically first suggested and fostered for the benefit of two sets of capitalists, and it has been used and was further used to divide the working class, to foster class hatred between the white man and the yellow man who were working for wages in California. Now, that takes us back to the origin of the label. Then the label becomes an asset in the employers' business. It becomes a commercial asset; it is part of his capital, part of his stock in trade, and in supporting the label we are violating that first sentence of our Preamble where we say that the employers and employed have nothing in common. That is all I have to say.

DEL. HAVER: I am sorry we waste so much time over this label question. I might have said something a little while ago that would probably have stopped the debate. I think we should let this rest for a short time at least and find out who is going to be entitled to that red label within the near future, whether it is going to be the organization that we have here now of the Industrial Workers of the World or a dual organization of the Industrial Workers of the World that has sprung up within the last three days. If you want any information from good authority you can prove it by delegates over here, and I will make my explanation clear if you want to hear.

A DELEGATE: Make it.

DEL. HAVER: I have been talking with several people around here that probably thought I was on the other side and I got quite confidential with them. One man that controls ten votes in this convention told me this morning that the reactionists—I think he

used that word—were going to recognize Sherman as president and that they were going to pay all their dues over to Sherman. He showed me a letter that he got from New York stating that that is what they are going to do, that they were going to recognize Sherman as still their president and that they were going to pay their dues over to him.

DEL. MCKINNON: I am for abolishing that label. I think we have made up our minds and should take a vote upon it.

DEL. KLEESE: Nearly all the points that can be covered have been covered, but there is one I want to nail right here. I am in favor of the label as an educational move. While in Denver speaking and organizing the workers there was another employer who wanted his shop organized in another city in the same line of industry for the sake of the union label. Right there was a good chance for those workers to demand half a dollar a day more on the strength of the label. I am in favor of the label as an educational move. Now, Bro. Sims, I suppose, will call me in the baby stage. He says if we are going to teach the working class anything we should teach them the pure thing right from the start. But they won't come; they are not ready for that. On the same ground what would be to prevent the union from organizing every non-union man in the country, because we have the organization that will get for the worker the full product of his labor? But we can't do that; that would be poor tactics. We would not be justified in taking the place of A. F. of L. strikers because it would be poor tactics, and for the same reason we can't throw down the label, in my judgment. Now, if that throwing down of the label would throw some manufacturers in British Columbia out of half a million dollars' worth of goods, like McDonald has spoken of, I would be willing to suspend the label for a few months. But I will close with these few words. My constituents are in favor of discarding the label, but I am not. I contend that we have not reached that stage where we can safely discard it. After a few more years it may be safe to do so, but I am in favor of the label for an educational move.

DEL. VEAL: Brother delegates, in view of the fact that we have recently received information that there is going to be a rival organization, and we have certainly been responsible this last year for the label, and there will be a contest with this rival organization of the I. W. W., as we see it, I move you that this question be referred back to the committee for further consideration. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: There is one motion before the house, and this motion will have to go as an amendment.

DEL. VEAL: I make it as an amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: It has been moved and seconded that we refer this question back to the Committee on Constitution for further consideration.

DEL. McMULLEN: Mr. President, I believe that under the rules of order that we are proceeding under a motion to refer carries with it the main issue of the question. Now, I have no objection particularly to referring this, but I do hope that the committee in their consideration will give this view on this matter some consideration. In my section of the country we view the label of this organization as a brand showing that the members of this organization are employed producing whatever article it may be upon, and in that way we feel that we are making a market for the men of our own organization.

DEL. ST. JOHN: I rise to a point of order. Del. McMullen is not talking to the motion to refer. He is talking on the merits of the case.

DEL. McMULLEN: I stated, I believe, that the entire question came up on the merits on the motion to refer, which, if you will look in Robert's Rules of Order, my good brother, you will find is correct.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: You have the floor.

DEL. McMULLEN: Now, we feel just this way, that we are making a market for our brothers of the Industrial Workers of the World when we consume the goods which they produce. We feel further that it is one way of stating to a community where there is a manufacturer using our cigars, that everybody employed there is a member of the I. W. W.—every single person. And we have so understood, and it applies that way everywhere it is used. Now, it furnishes an encouragement to those men who go into the organization when they know their brothers will assist them and furnish them work, and it is an important matter, when we consider the effect of the label upon the conditions under which men labor. As to these questions that have come in here as to the abolishment of this label, if you abolish that label we would not know whose goods we were using. We would not know whether they were made by our brothers or not.

DEL. RYAN: I rise to a point of order: that the delegate is not discussing the motion to refer, and we ought to go on to something else.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: I think you will have to decide on this after he proceeds with his remarks.

DEL. McMULLEN: My brother St. John desires to speak on something.

DEL. ST. JOHN: No, you have said a good deal already.

DEL. McMULLEN: Yes. Now, I sincerely hope that your efforts to prevent any unfriendly influence—and I am only speaking of this—

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Speak to the motion.

DEL. McMULLEN: I hope the committee, when they are considering this, will give these ideas some consideration. I hope they will come back in here also imbued with the idea of the brother who made this motion. We have listened to what was said on the floor about this new dual organization. I think the skeleton of this thing that is imbued with the thought and the spirit of—what do you call it?—this other, if there is another organization—

DEL. RYAN: Reactionary?

DEL. McMULLEN: No, not reactionary, but—

DEL. RYAN: Revolutionary?

DEL. McMULLEN: Revolutionary. I want to ask if that is not revolutionary. You can't get away from that. Ain't that revolutionary? If that is revolutionary I want the committee to look into that. He brought that up to your attention when he moved to refer. That was the idea he was imbued with, to refer that back to you to consider it and say then whether we should get the benefit of the use of this label—not the benefit, but the use of it. Now, I believe from the classifications that have been made up here that there is going to be a whole lot of revolutionists. I want to ask right here, is the revolution going to be referred to this committee for consideration or not?

DEL. KLEESE: A point of order, Bro. President. He is not talking to the motion.

DEL. McMULLEN: I have no objection to this being referred. We may consider it now. I have not, as I say, any objection to its going back for further consideration, but I believe these things will all come back again and a great deal of this will be reshaped, and if you are going to withdraw approval of that, please tell me what revolution of

thought permeates this organization to absolutely and completely destroy that which the founders thought was a sufficient stone to add to this building. Now, I want the committee to answer those things when they come here to show us why we should do these things.

DEL. RYAN: There is a motion to refer. Can't I speak to the motion to refer and go over the whole ground covered by Del. McMullen?

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Confine your remarks as far as possible to the question.

DEL. RYAN: I would like to say that I am opposed to the motion to refer.

DEL. PARKS: I would like to state that the motion to refer opens up the whole subject.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Do you want the floor on a point of order?

DEL. PARKS: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: State your point.

DEL. PARKS: It is that a motion to refer opens up the main question to debate and that these remarks are in order. That is according to Robert's Rules of Order that you are going by.

DEL. RYAN: I would have been done if you would have let me go ahead.

THE CHAIRMAN: That point is well taken. Bro. Ryan has the floor.

DEL. RYAN: I am obliged to both the Chair and Del. Wade Parks for their rulings in my favor. I understand the whole question is open now in discussing the motion to refer. I am opposed to the motion. I believe it is an injustice to this committee, who have given a lot of their time to deliberating on this matter and drawing up this amendment to the constitution, if it is referred to them again. It is not fair. I have been opposed to the tactics that have been employed in this convention recently of referring a good many important matters to the incoming General Executive Board. I am opposed to shoving the issue off and having this referred back to the committee with the hope that they will get us out of the difficulty in some way or other. There is no way to cut this Gordian knot except to cut it right here and now. I have listened carefully to many of the arguments introduced by the delegates and I propose to analyze one or two. One delegate says in opposition to the red label that we are helping out the capitalist class by patronizing the products of the I. W. W. that bear the labels of these trades; that we also help the capitalist class and the fakir labor organizations based on it, when they buy and put the label on the goods. But I contend that when we buy red label cigars or red label clothing, while we actually do help the capitalist class, at the same time we are helping to develop and build up an organization that is to overthrow capitalism. I believe that as the less of two evils we surely ought to be in favor of retaining the label on that account, if nothing else. As far as the miners are concerned it is a fact that we have no label. There is none on our product; absolutely none. A delegate has risen on the floor and he says you can get all kinds of shoddy with the label on. That is true, for the label does not stand for the quality of the goods at any time. It is merely for the conditions under which those goods are supposed to be made. Now, as miners, we can get along without a label, because our product seems to be highly appreciated by you fellows. So far as this thing being so extremely revolutionary is concerned, if that makes revolutionists, vote against the red label. If the capitalist master has got

an opportunity to increase his trade through the use of that red label, then I say you better go home and begin work over again. How are you going to emancipate the working class by buying meats or crackers or anything of that kind? How are you going to emancipate the working class by getting fall and winter suits made by members of a certain organization? One position is just as safe as the other. You fellows don't like the red label. You don't like a label of any kind. Why do you wear labels on your clothes? Why do you wear them? So that you may be known to the brothers as members of a so-called labor organization. Why do you fellows go about with red neckties? There is nothing to it. I am in favor of a recommendation that the label be given only under certain specific conditions, and those are that the house from which the label goes or the product which bears that label must be unionized from cellar to garret along industrial lines. Then you have something worthy of patronizing and putting the label on, but otherwise I am in favor of abolishing the label altogether. (Question called for.)

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Is there anyone else that wants to speak on this matter?

A DELEGATE: What is the question?

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The question is on the motion to refer. I believe as that is a privileged motion it is not amendable, is it, Bro. Parks? The secretary will call the roll.

DEL. DRESSLER: Can't we vote without a roll call?

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Unanimous vote.

DEL. FOX: I believe we should vote on it.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: All that wish to vote can vote. As Bro. Ryan has made an extended speech against referring, I believe it would be unfair to him and the people that were carried away by his speech, to carry it by unanimous consent. This is on the motion to refer. If you vote yes you vote to refer this back to the committee. If you vote no you vote that we shall pass upon it here.

The roll was called and resulted: Total vote, 567; Yes, 54; No, 513.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The motion to refer is lost. The motion before the house now is, Shall we concur in this report?

DEL. KLEESE: Read the report again.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The secretary will please read the report again.

DEL. KLEESE: Just the recommendation of the committee, that is all.

DEL. KINNEALLY: That the label be abolished: "Resolved, That Section 10 of Article VI shall be repealed in so far as it affects the label; that the label be hereby abolished."

(Roll call demanded.)

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The Chair will rule that as this motion to refer is a privileged motion and did not close the debate, this question is still open after the motion to refer has been disposed of, and I want the floor for just a minute before the question comes to a roll call. I will ask Bro. Kleese to take the chair.

(Del. Kleese took the chair.)

DEL. DUNCAN: Now, Bro. Chairman and brothers, I move you as an amendment to the motion now pending that we adopt Resolution No. A, which I will ask the secretary of the Constitution Committee to read, and that we amend our constitution according to that.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Do I hear a second to the motion?

(The motion was seconded.)

The resolution referred to was read by Del. Kinneally, as follows:



## RESOLUTION A.

Whereas, The universal label of our union has been productive of both good results, such as the general advertising of our name and the graphic presentation of the unity and comprehensive character of the I. W. W. to the minds of the proletariat; and of evil results, such as the advertising of merchandise, the fostering of a tendency towards the co-operation of the classes, the general confusion of the minds of working men in regard to the nature of the class struggle, and in its failure to explain its own significance as to just what or how much of the work on a product was done by I. W. W. men; and,

Whereas, It should be our endeavor to retain every weapon that is efficient for the proletariat and against the capitalists; be it, therefore,

Resolved, That in an endeavor to eliminate the evils and continue the good effects of our first year's experiment, we retain the universal label; and be it

Resolved, That the use of the universal label shall never be delegated to employers, but shall be vested entirely in our organization; and be it further

Resolved, That except on stickers, circulars and literature presenting the merits of the I. W. W. and emanating from the general offices of the I. W. W. the universal label shall be retained only as evidence of work done by I. W. W. men; and be it further

Resolved, That when the label is so printed it shall be done by the authority of our union without the intervention of any employer; and be it further

Resolved, That when our universal label is placed upon a commodity as evidence of work done by our men it shall be accompanied by an inscription underneath the label stating what the work is that our men have done, giving the name of the industrial department to which they belong and the number or numbers of their local unions, and that the universal label shall never be printed as evidence of work performed without this inscription; be it further

Resolved, That the universal label shall be of a uniform crimson color and always the same in design.

Respectfully submitted,

CARL H. DUNCAN,  
Representing Spokane Local Union 222.

DEL. McMULLEN: I would like to second the brother's amendment. I think that would be properly a substitute, wouldn't it? Wouldn't that be properly a substitute for their action?

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: I suppose it would cover the ground, yes.

DEL. DUNCAN: If the Chair rules that a substitute is in order I will make it a substitute.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: You have heard the reading of the substitute. Are you ready for the question? Do you want to speak to your motion, Bro. Duncan?

DEL. DUNCAN: I do, but I will be brief. The reason for offering this resolution is that I believe we can avoid all the evil results or nearly all that have accrued to us previously from the use of the label, and at the same time retain the good results. Nobody can doubt that we have added largely to our membership by the use of that label. It has done service as a great educational aid. I don't want to take up any more time.

(Question called for and roll call demanded.)

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The question has been called for. A roll call has been called for.

The roll call was begun.

DEL. DRESSLER: I voted yes before, but I voted that we should do away with the label, but as I have a new point of information on that I want to vote yes.

The roll call resulted as follows: Total vote, 558; Yes, 384; No, 174.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: I declare the substitute carried.

#### COMMITTEE ON STRIKES AND GRIEVANCES.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Now, brothers, before any further business comes before the assembly I want to announce that the Committee on Strikes and Grievances have an important announcement to make, and if there are no objections we will listen to that now. This affects the welfare of a few families of wage slaves in the city, as I understand, and should be given attention.

#### AID FOR WINDOW WASHERS.

DEL. VEAL: Fellow delegates, I hold in my hand a communication sent to this convention today.

The communication was read, as follows:

"Chicago, Oct. 1, 1906.

"Brother Delegates of the I. W. W. Convention:

"We, the undersigned members of the Strike Committee, by instructions of the remaining sixteen members of Window Washers' Local 299, I. W. W., still on strike, demand that we should be instructed what to do, whether to give up the battle or starve. We, the committee, have been asking aid since Tuesday, Sept. 27, without any results. We were promised to meet Friday the Strike and Lockout Committee, and all that we met was Del. Forberg of the committee. We personally interviewed Ex-President C. O. Sherman, and he stated that if the convention wanted to give further aid he was willing to sign a check. We have still a few dollars to divide from the special appeal, so it is up to you comrades to say to divide this or go back scabbing again. We also demand the withdrawal of our delegate immediately if we have no satisfactory answer.

"Fraternally yours,

"CHARLES BIANA,

"JOHN WOLF,

"FRED OLSEN,

"Strike Committee."

DEL. VEAL: Regarding what this committee said about Comrade Forberg, I would state that we all agreed that the convention should appropriate strike pay. We, the committee, three members of the committee, have agreed on a recommendation, and I am going to read our recommendation to this convention regarding this case:

"Local Union 299, Window Washers, have been out on strike two months. The committee have thoroughly investigated the conditions under which this strike was called and the way in which it has been conducted. We find that the strike was called illegally. We are convinced that certain so-called leaders advised the strike to injure the I. W. W. Their number was originally over sixty, and it is now decreased to sixteen. We therefore recommend that the strike be called off, and that a meeting of their union be called and the principles of industrial unionism be explained to them and that they be

advised how to build up an industrial union in their line of work. The committee further suggests that Bros. Heslewood and Haver be asked to address their meeting.

"J. W. BROWN,  
 "LILLIAN M. FORBERG,  
 "W. J. ROGERS,  
 "PHILIP VEAL,  
 "HENRY B. JACKSON,  
 "Committee."

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: You have heard the advice of the committee. What is your pleasure?

DEL. SIMS: I move to concur. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: It has been moved and seconded that we concur in the advice of the committee. Are you ready for the question? (Question called for.) If there is no objection it will be carried by unanimous vote. I declare it so carried.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: I just want to ask the committee whether they infer that the men will not get any more strike benefits, if this action is taken and the union declares the strike off.

DEL. BROWN: That is up to the convention.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: I just wanted to find that out.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: What is the pleasure of the convention in regard to the strike committee?

DEL. SCHWEINBURG: I know the history of that strike. I know the development of that strike. I don't want to go into the merits of the strike, but I think it is our duty to pay those men that are still out, the sixteen men, their strike benefit for the week that they are out before the strike is called off. It would make a very bad impression upon those men and every man who ever wanted to join the organization if you let the men go back to work or order them to go back to work without paying at least for the last week they were out. Therefore I move you that this convention instruct the General Secretary-Treasurer to pay those men the strike benefit that they are entitled to. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: It has been moved and seconded that the Secretary-Treasurer be instructed to pay these striking window washers the amount of strike benefit due them. Are you ready for the question? (Question called for.)

DEL. HESLEWOOD: I would like to ask a question. What is the strike benefit? How much do you pay them?

SEC. TRAUTMANN: We have paid every week \$5 per man strike benefit.

DEL. HESLEWOOD: No objection.

DEL. McMULLEN: A further question, and that is this: I understood the other day that this was an illegal strike. Now, if it is a legally called strike I want to support it, but if it is an illegally called strike I am not going to support it in this convention.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: I would say, Bro. McMullen, that as far as I have learned of the situation, it was a strike called by what we revolutionists call the reactionists.

DEL. McMULLEN: But was it called in a reactionary manner or was it called in a revolutionary manner?

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: As I understand it, in a reactionary manner.

DEL. McMULLEN: Then I will say you may vote for it, but I am going to vote against it.

DEL. SCHWEINBURG: The organization has paid strike benefits already to those men, but we didn't discuss the question of the merits

of the strike. The strike is called, we will say, illegally, but we have paid out already many thousand dollars to men through the general organization. If they go back at the present time when the men are in need and we don't pay any more strike benefits and we call the strike off, I think it would be an injustice to those men that were misled not to pay them strike benefits any more. We should show to the men that we are willing to do something for them in spite of the fact that it was called illegally. If Bro. McMullen will think of the case he will say it was our duty to pay those men strike benefits.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Do you wish to speak, Bro. Olsen?

DEL. OLSEN: Never mind; he said what I wanted to say.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: If there is no objection this motion will be carried unanimously.

DEL. PARKS: I object.

A DELEGATE: What is the motion?

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: To pay the strike benefit which is due them.

DEL. HESLEWOOD: Is the Constitution Committee through with its report?

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: No. Now, before the Constitution Committee resumes I want to afford an opportunity at least to these brothers that wish to talk on this; Bro. Haver or Heslewood.

DEL. HESLEWOOD: I am not so clear about the merits, but I would like to say that I know so little about the strike of the window washers that I feel I would be unable to vote intelligently. I believe there are delegates here that are posted on this whole matter.

DEL. McMULLEN: Was that motion carried, do I understand?

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: It was carried by unanimous consent.

DEL. McMULLEN: I can't give unanimous consent.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The secretary will record you in the negative.

DEL. PARKS: I understand the strike was illegal and it was called for the benefit of certain people who wanted to attack the I. W. W. and disrupt our organization. That is my understanding, and on that ground I object to the unanimous consent and want to be registered against all kinds of fakirs, whether in or outside of the organization.

DEL. OLSEN: As far as the illegal calling of the strike is concerned I will explain to you delegates how it came. We were in trouble with the Building Managers' Association, and before the strike was called we called on the Executive Board and President Sherman and had a conversation with them. Furthermore, as far as the obligation of the organization is concerned, after Sherman took it in his hands, it was left with the Executive Board and the strike could not be avoided, and we take the ground that whether it was called legally or illegally it is up to the convention after the Executive Board takes hold of it. And as far as the need of it was concerned the strike was badly needed. I don't think it was illegal, for the officers of the organization already had a conversation with the employers and called the men out.

A DELEGATE: What is the decision about calling off the strike?

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The strike, as I understand it, is over and the committee is prepared to recommend that we order the General Secretary-Treasurer to remit the amount.

DEL. LINGENFELTER: I rise to a point of order that the question has been settled, and this continued discussion upon the question of reopening it is out of order.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Your point of order is well taken.

DEL. FITZGERALD: I want to speak and clear up the merits of the strike.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: That is out of order. We will now listen to the Constitution Committee.

#### CONSTITUTION—SALARIES OF OFFICERS.

DEL. KINNEALLY (reporting on behalf of Committee on Constitution): In reference to the salaries of the general officers, the proposition presented by Local 222 is short and might be read and might save the trouble of talking nonsense later on:

"Whereas, A working man who pays dues in a genuine labor organization has a right to know where his money is spent; therefore be it

"Resolved, That no one shall draw a salary from the Industrial Workers of the World except the same is provided for in our constitution, and that the exact amount of any salary and wage paid to any officer or employe of the Industrial Workers of the World shall be named in our constitution." (Signed.)

We, the committee, recommend that the first paragraph on page 10 of the constitution shall be amended by striking out the words "such remuneration as shall be fixed by the convention or the General Executive Board," and inserting in place thereof "\$125 per month and the Assistant General Secretary-Treasurer \$100 per month."

DEL. MARKLEY: I move to concur. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: It has been moved and seconded that we concur in the report of the committee. Are you ready for the question?

DEL. SCHWEINBURG: Mr. Chairman and fellow delegates, as much as I am in favor of the resolution of the Committee on Constitution, yet I would like to ask a question of the secretary of the Committee on Constitution. He says here in his resolution "All officers and employes of the I. W. W."

DEL. KINNEALLY: That is what the mover said.

DEL. SCHWEINBURG: That is what the committee said, "All officers and employes."

DEL. KINNEALLY: No, we only named the remuneration.

DEL. SCHWEINBURG: Will you please read it again?

DEL. KINNEALLY: We recommend that the first paragraph on page 10 shall be amended by striking out the words "Such remuneration as may be fixed by the convention or the General Executive Board," and inserting in place thereof "\$125 per month and the Assistant General Secretary-Treasurer \$100 per month."

DEL. TULLAR: I move its adoption. (Seconded.)

DEL. SCHWEINBURG: The reason I was asking that question was that I thought it said all employes of the organization, and that would certainly include the organizers and all other employes that are to be employed throughout the country. That would be a very hard thing for the convention to decide. It must be left in the hands of somebody to say about the organizers, but if that only refers to the officers in the office I am satisfied with it.

DEL. RIORDAN: I wish to amend it by striking out "\$100 per month" and inserting "\$125 per month."

DEL. FORBERG: I second the motion.

DEL. RIORDAN: For the reason that I don't believe in paying a higher salary to one man working in the office than to another. I think the salary paid to those two men should be equal.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: A motion has been made and seconded that we strike out "\$100" and insert "\$125," making the salaries equal. Are you ready for the question?

ALT. KIEFE: I believe \$100 a month is sufficient for any working man to live on. A majority of the delegates here and the majority

of the rank and file which they represent, I am willing to state that they don't get \$50 a month, and have to live on it, and that is why the conditions are always such that when they come here they can scarcely stay here to attend the convention three weeks. I do not believe our officials should be paid a bourgeois salary of \$1,500 a year, which would be \$125 a month.

DEL. GOLDBERG: A point of order.

ALT. KIEFE: I am talking to the question.

DEL. GOLDBERG: My point of order is this: We have got today working men who are getting \$27 a week and have a steady job.

ALT. KIEFE: I do believe Comrade Riordan is right. They should be given the same wages, and I don't like to treat them by giving them just sufficient, like a wage slave, to eat at a ten or fifteen-cent restaurant sometimes. I believe \$100 a month is sufficient salary. That is \$1,200 a year. That is twice as much as the average working class of this country get. According to the capitalist statistics in Washington the average wage-earner in this country only gets \$456 a year. I believe if we cut that in two, to \$600, they would be getting more than the average wage slave that belongs to this organization. I believe we should reduce the salary from \$125 at least to \$75 a month for both officers.

DEL. REID: I rise to make an amendment to the motion, that the salary of these two officers be each \$100 a month. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: An amendment to the amendment has been made to the effect that both secretary-treasurers be paid \$100 per month. Are you ready for the question?

ALT. KIEFE: I want to make a substitute for the whole, to make the salaries \$75 per month.

DEL. SCHWEINBURG: I think \$10 a week is better.

DEL. RIORDAN: Anyone that has ever worked on an office of that kind would perhaps know that during the month whoever is working in that office is obliged to hand out to men that come there absolutely broke, without the price of a night's lodging, even more than the extra \$25 a month, and he can't get it back. I know from experience that it will cost whoever may be in this position at least \$25 a month for men who come there absolutely broke, without the price of a meal's victuals or the price of a night's lodging. You should take those things into consideration in connection with this.

DEL. SCHWEINBURG: I can't agree with Del. Reid to pay the officers only \$100 a month. We are working men organized in an organization and going out and trying to get better conditions, but we are going to pay our own employes as little as possible. A man who is working in the office of the Industrial Workers of the World is working not only eight or nine hours a day, but I know from the experience of what I have seen there in that office that that man is forced to work fifteen or sixteen and more hours a day up there, often every day in the week and from early morning till late at night. And I don't think \$125 is too much for any man who is working faithfully for the organization. No matter what you say, we are going out to fight our employers every day for better conditions, more pay and less hours, and it is not right for us to pay our employes less than they got before. It is a fact that the average wages of working men are less than \$25, but there are many men in our organization that get more than \$25 a week. We cannot go and look just at the men who have paid the lowest wages, but we have to go and see what work a man is performing and what duty he is discharging for the organization. If you want to have men that will do all the work and

be faithful to the organization, you must pay them whatever is right, and not try to reduce their wages to as low a figure as possible.

DEL. DUNCAN: I do not think we ought to establish a precedent here in the Industrial Workers of the World of giving the price of a meal or the price of a night's lodging from our headquarters or providing a fund for that purpose, but if that is going to be done and and if it is going to be recognized as part of the necessary expenses of one of our officers I think it would be better to establish a special fund for the purpose.

DEL. FOOTE: A point of order. That has nothing to do with the question. That is a voluntary contribution that Bro. Riordan speaks of which many a working man makes. I do it in my shop.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Your point of order is well taken. It is a matter of personal choice whether or not the secretary gives it out of his own pocket.

DEL. DUNCAN: I know that our General Secretaries will both have a hard day's work up there and they deserve to get the best pay and I believe they ought to be paid exactly alike. But I don't think that any working class organization ought to establish the precedent of paying more than \$100 a month, and I believe that they can exist on that providing they don't go into the charity business, and I don't think they ought to.

DEL. HENDRICKS: Is a substitute for the pending motion in order?

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Bro. Markley wishes to speak.

DEL. GOLDBERG: I want to speak, too.

DEL. MARKLEY:—Mr. Chairman, we go out to organize the working class and we take the statistics as given out to us by the Republican Party in the person of Carroll D. Wright. We see there that their share of the product is \$2,460 a year. I hope that when \$125 is suggested here that we won't go into the good wages business; I hope we will stand by what was suggested first. I wish it had been \$150, because it is easy to talk, you know. A poor unfortunate will come in, and if I have a dime in my pocket and I have eaten my breakfast and I know he has not, he may get the dime. Now, there is no mathematics that will figure out that kind of a proposition. The \$125 is all right.

DEL. GOLDBERG: As a matter of fact we expect our officers should be capable men. Now, for a good secretary who must turn out a good day's work it requires a good physical and mental man. You find in the trades, in the printing trade, in the cutting trade of the clothing industry, we find men who don't possess as much ability as the secretary of the Industrial Workers of the World have been getting salaries as high as \$25, \$27, and \$30 sometimes a week. Now, if it pays a capitalist under the present system of society to pay as high as \$27 a week to a man who possesses simply physical strength, why shouldn't we, the Industrial Workers of the World, pay a man the right price who is worth it? We cannot establish a precedent for every human being alike. We must pay according to his ability. We want the best man to represent us as secretary, and then this should be taken into consideration; the assistant secretary would not have so much responsibility on himself and he would not have so much work to do because we find from past experience that the same secretary-treasurer who is occupied at his desk for thirteen hours is at the same time wanted to deliver a speech, and he can't charge extra while he is working overtime. Why shouldn't we take this into considera-

tion? I think he is deserving of \$25 a month more than the assistant secretary who is doing other work. I am in favor of the original recommendation. (Question called for.)

DEL. FORBERG: I am in favor of the original amendment to pay the two men in the office, the Secretary and Assistant Secretary, the same salary, and that it shall be \$125 a month. I will simply accept that because it is the recommendation of the committee. If they had made it more I should have liked it better. My reason for saying that I want them both paid the same is that I am absolutely opposed to the competitive wage system, and for an organization that is about to hire two men of equal ability and doing an equal amount of work, to say that simply because one has a higher sounding title than the other it will pay him more a month than the other, is absolutely contrary to my principles at least. Therefore I am in favor of the amendment that they shall be paid the same amount. It is very evident that \$100 a month instead of \$125 is unreasonable for men who do the work that those men will have to do and who can get better wages if they work for any capitalist corporation. I suppose we have men right here in the convention, at least we have one of them from every city doing the same sort of work and that get from \$35 to \$50 a week, and to ask our employees to work for less than \$125 a month looks picayunish and small on the part of this organization. I am opposed to anything except this amendment to pay these two men \$125 each per month.

DEL. HENDRICKS: I want to ask a question, and if I am in order I want to make a motion. Is a substitute for the pending motion now in order?

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: As I understand, yes.

DEL. HENDRICKS: Now, I have found out from some remark on the other side of the hall that \$2,400 a year is the amount of each producer per year. I believe that I am getting somewhere in that neighborhood myself. I believe I am getting all I produce, if that is the case, and I believe these two secretaries are entitled to all they produce, and I move you as a substitute that they be paid \$2,400 a year, payable monthly.

DEL. McMULLEN: I second that substitute, Mr. President.

DEL. FISCHER: Roll call.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: A motion has been made as a substitute that we pay our Secretary-Treasurer and Assistant Secretary-Treasurer \$2,400 a year.

DEL. COX: I suggest a rising vote on that proposition. All in favor of that, stand on their feet.

DEL. McMULLEN: Wait. I want to speak on that proposition, Mr. Chairman, on the substitute.

DEL. De LEON: I rise to a point of order, that the substitute cannot be an amendment to the amendment. The substitute must go with the original motion. When a motion is before the house and an amendment is made, that amendment will be a substitute and overthrows the original motion. After you have made an amendment to an amendment you can make no further amendment, and this substitute is subterfuge. My point of order is that it is out of order.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Fellow workers, the purpose of this convention is to arrange a constitution for the working class. There is no doubt but what this substitute would be overwhelmingly defeated, and at this stage I will take the liberty to declare it out of order, and we will proceed on the amendment to the amendment.

ALT. KIEFE: State the amendment to the amendment.



DEL. KINNEALLY: That both secretaries receive \$125 a month.

ALT. KIEFE: No, if I am not mistaken it is that both parties get \$100 a month.

DEL. KINNEALLY: Or \$100 a month, yes.

DEL. HENDRICKS: Did you not state that I was in order on that motion?

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: I did.

DEL. HENDRICKS: Then you reversed it?

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: I reversed my ruling, yes, on the ground that all this work is delaying the convention. You have the liberty of appealing from the decision of the Chair, but otherwise it will be so ordered.

DEL. HENDRICKS: I never appealed from any decision of any chair in my life, and I am not going to practice it upon you.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Did you take an appeal, Bro. Hendricks?

DEL. HENDRICKS: No.

(Roll call demanded.)

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The Secretary will call the roll on the amendment to the amendment.

DEL. KINNEALLY: That each Secretary receive \$100 a month in place of \$125 is the amendment to the original.

The roll call was taken and resulted: Total vote, 449; yes, 15; no, 434.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The amendment to the amendment is lost. We will now vote on the amendment, which is to make both salaries \$125 a month.

DEL. SCHWEINBURG: Unanimous vote.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: A unanimous vote is called for.

DEL. REID: I wish to be recorded against it.

DEL. McMULLEN: I wish to be recorded in the negative.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Call the roll.

The roll call was then finished.

DEL. DUNCAN: I want to vote no, but I want it understood that it is not because I do not want them to draw the same salary. I think the amount named is higher than the average wage worker makes. I think our officers ought to have salaries alike and which are equal with the average working man.

The roll call was then finished.

DEL. REID: I want to make a statement as to why I voted no. It is simply this, that I believe under the present condition of the finances of the organization and the call for organizers, \$100 a month is ample under the circumstances.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem (Del. Kleese): Now, if the brothers will allow, the Chair wants to state why he voted no. My reason is this: The organizers get \$18 a week and expenses.

DEL. MARKLEY: Ten.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Well, even ten, and I think each officer and each organizer and the girl stenographers in the office should get the same money, and that is why I voted no for \$125 and yes for \$100.

The vote resulted: Total vote, 550; Yes, 316; No, 234.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The amendment is carried. That does away with the original motion. The Chair understands.

DEL. RIORDAN: I move to concur in the report of the committee as amended.

DEL. DUNCAN: Will the committee read again the resolution that it has offered, and then the report which we have adopted and par-

tially concurred in? I want to know if we concur in the rest of the resolution.

DEL. MARKLEY: Yes.

DEL. DUNCAN: If so, wouldn't it be in order to name the salary of the organizers and other employees?

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: They will probably bring that up later, Bro. Duncan.

DEL. DUNCAN: Have you got that provided for?

DEL. KINNEALLY: Not yet.

DEL. DUNCAN: Then I move you that all paid organizers of the Industrial Workers of the World get a uniform salary or wage of \$3 a day and expenses, including car fare and hotel expenses, not exceeding one dollar a day. (Seconded.)

DEL. DE LEON: A point of order on a matter of discipline. That recommendation has come from the Committee on Constitution. The Committee on Constitution has a report upon it, and if every member in the convention is going to take it upon himself to make motions, will they be recognized?

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Your point of order is well taken, Bro. De Leon.

#### CONSTITUTION.—STRIKE ASSISTANCE.

The report of the Committee on Constitution was continued:

DEL. KINNEALLY: The next is in reference to strikes. The document is a long document. In fact, there are two documents on the same subject. By reading the recommendation it might make clear the object of the presentation.

"We recommend the insertion of the following clause in the constitution and the repeal of all existing sections in conflict therewith:

"A local union shall be entitled to assistance from the general organization in case of strike only when the general organization has allowed or endorsed such strike."

DEL. DUNCAN: A point of order. I made a motion and there was a second to it regarding the salaries of organizers. Is that motion before the house?

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Bro. Duncan, a member of the Constitution Committee said that that was now pending before the committee, and I ruled it out of order, allowing them to make a report on that. When their report comes up we will have a debate on that subject.

DEL. McMULLEN: I move to concur in the committee's report. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded that we concur in the committee's report. Are you ready for the question?

DEL. ROGERS: A point of information. This strike would not include a lockout, would it—this financial obligation?

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: As the Chair understands it, that would be left to the Executive Board. That is my understanding of it.

DEL. HAVER: I think it would be more appropriate to have something in the constitution in regard to lockouts, because sometimes we have lockouts happen in factories and places where we least expect them, and the people there are sometimes in very poor circumstances and need assistance immediately in case of lockouts. So I think we ought to insert something in the constitution. I am not just prepared to recommend anything, but I think somebody here may be able to do so, because you will have lots of them in the near

future. If you are going out to organize, naturally you are going to have lockouts, because we have found it so in the past. As soon as you have a factory or shop organized and the concern finds it out they don't give you time to ask for recognition of the union, they lock you out. I wish somebody here would make some kind of a recommendation on that point.

DEL. LUNDY: I think we should make some provision for lockouts. We were asked to run two machines by setting up a job at one end of the machine while the machine was working and then bring the head over, and I refused to do it. We called a meeting of the union. I was practically discharged. We were talking of going on strike, but they didn't give us time to strike. They were taken back the following morning, and there was a big sign on the office the next morning that the shop would be closed on account of a reorganization of the company. There was never any reorganization. It was simply a lockout of the union. Consequently when they open again you don't go back as strikers. We had no time to prepare for anything. We had only one night's notice. There should be some provision made for lockouts.

DEL. SCHWEINBURG: As I understand the resolution of the committee it only deals with strikes and not with lockouts.

DEL. KINNEALLY: That is all.

DEL. SCHWEINBURG: It has nothing to do with lockouts. It only deals with strikes. There is a distinction between a strike and a lockout.

DEL. LUNDY: I understand.

DEL. ROGERS: Another point of information. In a lockout or strike that came spontaneously on unorganized labor, we as I. W. W. men refused to work in the mills while these unorganized men were out to better their condition. There has no local union ever asked for assistance from the I. W. W. because every member of the I. W. W. in the village of Lake Charles understands the proposition. We know we can't get them out, especially when there is a lot of men trying the same experience. But this question will affect us in the future. Now, when men go out spontaneously, unorganized labor, we as I. W. W. men can't stay in when they are out. I would like to know how this particular resolution would affect them under those circumstances. We are confronted with another proposition. The boss in Lake Charles says that unless every man renounces the union that he belongs to that he can come and get his money.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: As I understand it there will be other provision made for lockouts.

DEL. ROGERS: It is a point of information that I want.

THE CHAIRMAN: If any of you brothers think this is not sufficient you have it within your power to amend it to include lockouts.

(Question called for.)

DEL. SCHWEINBURG: I can't see what we are sitting here and defining strikes for. The Committee on Constitution says distinctly that in case of a strike of the local union it shall be referred to the General Executive Board. But that brother over there—I don't know what your name is.

DEL. ROGERS: Rogers is my name.

DEL. SCHWEINBURG: Bro. Rogers says in case unorganized men are out on strike and they ask for assistance the I. W. W. will help them in their struggle to better their condition. But the General Executive Board will take care of that. The General Executive Board look into the merits of every case and they have to do it.

If the men belong to a local union and the I. W. W. go out on strike in sympathy with unorganized men in a shop to better their condition, I don't believe the General Executive Board will refuse to endorse that strike, because it would pay the cost to organize those men who are at present nor organized.

DEL. DUNCAN: I cannot understand what you said here, brother.

DEL. HAVER: I want to explain something that is going on in the city of New York today. The Silk Workers in Brooklyn have twenty-five men locked out because they stood for half a day in hot water. That was the only excuse made. The female help in question had to do that. It was not because of that. It was because they found there was going to be an organization. The shop was nearly organized, and we organized it, and from the time it was organized there was nothing but continual trouble. Those men have been out seven weeks. Bro. Trautmann made a statement the other day about sending money. They never received a cent of money, and they have been in the organization almost a year. They have been out seven weeks and never got a cent. Therefore I want this thing rectified.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: It went to their place.

DEL. HAVER: It didn't go to the place that was locked out. It went to a place that was on strike.

Question called for.)

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: The question has been called for. We will have the roll call.

DEL. RICHTER: General consent.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: If there's no objection it will be adopted by unanimous consent. Hearing none, it is so ordered.

DEL. LINGENFELTER: I move that we adjourn. (Seconded.)

DEL. KINNEALLY: There is only one more.

A DELEGATE: It will keep till eight o'clock.

DEL. FOX: Maybe it will pass.

DEL. KINNEALLY: I will say that this document is from Del. Ryan, of the Mining Department, and is a very important document, and takes up and creates an important issue, and you might as well know it:

#### ARIZONA STATE UNION—Resolution J.

"Whereas, the Arizona State Union No. 3 of the Department of Mining, desires to be chartered as a Council of the I. W. W.; and

"Whereas, the constitution of the I. W. W. has no provision for the chartering of such organizations; there fore be it

"Resolved, that the Committee on Constitution is hereby instructed to formulate an amendment to the constitution to apply to the case of the Arizona State Union and similar organizations which may desire to be incorporated.

Albert Ryan,

"Delegate Department of Mining."

DEL. KINNEALLY: That was referred to the Constitution Committee. We recommend that the matter be referred to the General Executive Board to be acted upon jointly with the administration of the Mining Department.

DEL. RYAN: I will have to make a somewhat lengthy statement to the convention on that. I would like, if there is no objection, that it be laid over and make it the first order of business tomorrow, whenever it suits the convenience of the convention. I would not like to take up your time now because there are possibly changes to be made.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: It is just six o'clock. If there is no objection we will adjourn till nine o'clock tomorrow morning.

The convention then adjourned until nine o'clock Tuesday morning, October 2.

#### FIFTEENTH DAY.

#### TUESDAY, OCT. 2. MORNING SESSION.

Chairman St. John called the convention to order at nine o'clock Tuesday morning, Oct. 2.

The roll of members was called by the Secretary.

#### ELECTION OF OFFICERS.

DEL. DUNCAN: I move to suspend the regular order of business and proceed to the election of officers. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been regularly moved and seconded to suspend the regular order of business and proceed to the election of officers.

DEL. DRESSLER: I want to make an amendment that we suspend it till this afternoon when all the delegates will be here. There seems to be only one set of delegates here, and it would not be right for the other organizations to elect officers now. I make an amendment that we lay it over till this afternoon.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have heard the motion; are you ready for the question? Are there any objections to granting unanimous consent to this motion?

A DELEGATE: I object.

DEL. DE LEON: What is the motion?

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is to suspend the rules and proceed with the election of officers.

DEL. DE LEON: In view of the fact that so many delegates are absent, I move to amend that it be made a special order of business when the hour of ten strikes. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: You have heard the amendment. Is there any objection?

A DELEGATE: What is the amendment?

THE CHAIRMAN: The amendment is to make the election of officers a special order of business at ten o'clock. Are there any objections to granting unanimous consent to this amendment?

DEL. DUNCAN: I object on the ground that there is no financial report submitted as yet to the Industrial worker. I believe this body should know what has gone on in general, one place as well as another. For that reason I object till we have the financial report.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any further remarks?

DEL. MARKLEY: There is hardly a delegate in this body that has not received this financial report.

DEL. HENDRICKS: When?

DEL. MARKLEY: Before you came over. I got one this morning.

DEL. HENDRICKS: That is not a financial report.

The roll call was demanded and taken resulting: Total vote, 532; yes, 324; no, 208.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is carried. The rules are suspended.

#### AUDITING COMMITTEE.

DEL. SIMS: I move that the Auditing Committee take the next hour in making their report to this convention. I have learned that the Auditing Committee possibly are ready, and I move you that that will be the next order of business, that the Auditing Committee will make their report.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection to the Auditing Committee reporting?

DEL. FOX: A point of order. You must understand that this committee has more work than any other committee in this convention. It reported here some days ago, and you accepted its suggestion, that it would not go over the whole of the accounts, since the expert bookkeepers had been employed for that purpose and had made their report, and I will state that from that report there is not a shortage of \$900 as some of the delegates are reporting for a certain faction in this convention, but the expert bookkeepers expressly report that the shortage is \$19.86; that is, they could not make the books balance to that extent, \$19.86, and of course if the Secretary cannot produce receipts for that amount he will have to make it personally good. But the Auditing Committee is not ready to report now. It will meet again tonight, and in the morning possibly it can make a report, and it will give you a report, and a good one.

DEL. GOLDBERG: Since the Auditing Committee cannot report, I move that the Ways and Means shall be the next order of business.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Constitution Committee has the right of way unless there is a special order of business.

DEL. SIMS: Mr. Chairman, I want to know what has been the decision on this proposition.

THE CHAIRMAN: As to what is the decision on this motion of yours?

DEL. SIMS: Yes, on this motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Auditing Committee say they are not ready to report, so they cannot report. For that reason the first order of business is the Constitution Committee report.

#### CONSTITUTION.—ARIZONA STATE UNION.

DEL. KINNEALLY (reporting on behalf of Constitution Committee): Last night when we adjourned we were on the question of the Arizona State Union. (The Ryan resolution was again read.) The committee recommends that the matter be referred to the General Executive Board to be acted upon jointly with the administration of the Mining Department. That was presented just before adjournment last night. It is now before the house.

DEL. MARKLEY: I move to concur. (Seconded.)

DEL. RYAN: Mr. Chairman, relative to the circumstances by which we are surrounded at this time in the Arizona State Union, I would have no objection whatever to the recommendation of the committee that the matter be handled jointly by the General Executive Board of the Industrial Workers of the World and the Department of Mining Industry, but I would like to state a few facts in connection with the case to show why we should like to have action taken in this convention. In the constitution of the Western Federation of Miners we have a provision that enables local unions in any state or territory to organize into a state or district union. First in Arizona we have a district union composed of about sixteen small unions. We eventually reached out and changed into a state organization of the Western Federation of Miners, and that comprises all of the local unions of the Western Federation in Arizona. We were chartered in September, 1904, and we had at that time 904 members in good standing in the entire territory, and during the time that has elapsed we have succeeded in building up a membership of 2,235 according to our last report, and while we do not claim that we have done that alone as an organization in the I. W. W., presumably the distribution of litera-

ture has aided us very much. Now, we are not yet satisfied. All of our membership pays a per capita tax of ten cents a member per month, paid into the general fund which is in the hands of the Secretary-Treasurer of the organization, and this money can be devoted to no other purpose except organization. We were not satisfied with confining our efforts so far as organization is concerned to the mining industry alone. We feel as an integral part of a working class organization like the Industrial Workers of the World that we would like to get all I. W. W. locals in Arizona with us, and all locals of all other organizations regardless of their national affiliations. The Globe Miners' Union, which is the strongest union in the organization, submitted a referendum which was sent out to referendum providing for affiliation of the organization as a union, and instructing the General Executive Board to procure a charter from the Industrial Workers of the World as an industrial council. That was defeated by about 14 votes in the referendum. The matter was again brought up in our last convention, August 13th and 14th, and the convention finally decided that they would issue manifestoes to all local unions in Arizona, regardless of national affiliation, inviting delegates from all those different locals to meet in convention in Phoenix, Arizona, on November 12th. In the meantime the manifesto will be issued to all of those locals outlining our position. We now find that the old constitution of the I. W. W. makes no provision for an organization of such a general nature and formation as a state organization. Outside of local unions and industrial departments there is provision only for industrial councils, which are essentially local. Now, we feel that we cannot get an industrial council chartered, for the simple reason that we cover the entire territory, nor are we in favor of coming into the I. W. W. as a state organization because we, as well as all other members of the Industrial Workers of the World, want to ignore geographical divisions as much as possible, but with the hope that this convention would see its way clear to acknowledge us in some form as a state organization. We would be perfectly willing to get a charter that would give us power enough to reach over into Texas, Southern California or anywhere else. In that way we can have a larger number of members; we can have some organizers in the field, and we would help to build up, not only the mining industry, but the locals of all others. Now, as I say, this convention is called for November 12th. All preparatory work should have been done by this time. If the recommendation of the committee is concurred in it seems to me it will take at least one month before the General Executive Board and the Executive Board of the Mining industry will be able to take action on the matter. Now, that is my objection at this time to the adoption of the report of the committee. I have spoken to the members of the committee individually, and while they have given me no definite assurance, they also recognize the necessity of having something in the constitution that would fit this particular case. And I don't speak for the Arizona State Union alone. I find, according to the report of the Secretary-Treasurer, that there are five or six similar organizations—organizations in the same position. If we don't settle the matter for the Arizona State Union at this time it may be that you will have to go over the same ground again and again, especially regarding places like Seattle and Toronto.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Especially Washington and places where they intend to start an industrial council and are canvassing the entire territory.

DEL. RYAN: So I am not satisfied with the recommendation of the

committee. While I will certainly vote against it, I will be willing to abide by the action of the convention.

DEL. FISCHER: I do believe it is necessary to make an amendment to the constitution. All that is necessary is to enlarge the term.

DEL. RYAN: What are you going to call it? Industrial council?

DEL. FISCHER: Call it a district council.

DEL. RYAN: What title would you give it?

DEL. FISCHER: District council.

DEL. RYAN: Are you going to call it a district council in Arizona?

DEL. FISCHER: Just the same as we call it the District Council of New York you can call it the District Council of Arizona. Arizona is a locality. It is not known as a territory.

DEL. RYAN: We are not in favor of that. We want a charter that will enable us to take in Industrial Workers at San Antonio or anywhere else in the district. We want to be in a position to send organizers all over the country if our funds will permit us to do so.

DEL. FISCHER: Just call it the District Council of a certain town, the largest town in Arizona. I don't know what is the largest town in Arizona.

DEL. RYAN: They are certainly going to have geographical limits.

DEL. KINNEALLY: I would suggest—I don't know whether it will cover the ground or not—"Resolved, that district councils can and shall be organized by the locals and industrial unions covering an area of two states or more." Won't that cover it?

DEL. MARKLEY: That settles it.

DEL. FOX: "One state or more."

DEL. KINNEALLY: Well, one state or more. This is offered as a substitute for the recommendation of the committee, so as to take immediate action. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been regularly moved and seconded, as a substitute for the recommendation of the Committee on Constitution on the Arizona matter, that the following be adopted: "Resolved, that district councils can be organized by locals covering an area of one state or more."

DEL. KINNEALLY: That will be made a provision of the constitution.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have heard the substitute. Are you ready for the question?

DEL. FRENCH: It seems to me that the substitute makes the thing clumsy, in that I don't see any necessity for it at all. I agree with Fischer that there isn't any need for either of these provisions. The wording that we adopted yesterday, "Industrial councils for the purpose of establishing general solidarity in any given district may be organized, and shall be composed of delegates from not less than five local industrial or local recruiting unions," covers the whole ground. Now, if all the I. W. W. locals and all Mining Department locals in Arizona and surrounding territory within any given territory agree to apply to the General Executive Board for a charter as an industrial council, they can call themselves a copper range or an industrial council or anything they choose as a name, and they can request that they be allowed to cover the territory extending down to San Antonio or over into Santa Fe or somewhere else. They don't take in a territory that is scattered, and that can't be brought together in a council or in any other way than by combining in what is now the Arizona State Union. Now, if all of these locals that are scattered



throughout Arizona and parts of Texas or New Mexico will jointly apply to the General Executive Board for a charter to form an industrial council and be given a charter as the Arizona District Council, or any name they may choose, that fits the bill, the same as the one referred to by the General Secretary-Treasurer that wants to cover the whole Sound District, up around Seattle. And it will be the same thing with this. There is a district council in New York now with a radius of twenty-five miles. We take in any locals that are willing to join us. Outside of Greater New York they apply for a charter to the Executive Board, and the Board gives a charter for that district. Notice that a given district means that you define the district at the time you apply for the charter, so I don't see any difficulty at all under the present constitution of chartering Arizona and giving them the district and field that they can cover. Let it cover all I. W. W. locals and mining department locals. There is no hitch in that as far as the department locals and locals outside of the department. As the industrial council is merely for establishing local solidarity within any district, when we say local solidarity within the district the term "local" can be applied in regard to that district, or in regard to general solidarity within that district. There is no difficulty. It is understood that the local recruiting unions and industrial unions must apply for a charter to establish solidarity in that district as members of the Industrial Workers of the World. But even as the constitution stands I can see that there is no difficulty in the way of satisfying the desires of the comrades in Arizona.

DEL. LINGENFELTER: I would like to ask Del. Ryan a question. Bro. Ryan, didn't I understand you to say that you wished a charter that would include not only the Industrial Workers in the Mining Department, but other locals in that district? What would you do with me? I myself favor the proposition of taking in those locals in that part of the country that cannot be chartered under the Industrial Workers of the World, provided they accept the manifesto that you sent out from your body. I understand it that way. I would like to be clear on it.

DEL. RYAN: I expect we will have no difficulty in getting in seven or eight locals of the I. W. W. that are chartered direct by the Executive Board. We are going to make an effort to do so through organized propaganda among the different locals of blacksmiths, carpenters and all other classes that are now affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, to invite them to send delegates to take part in our convention, and we propose to act in the same way that we did in the first annual convention of the Industrial Workers of the World. Those who go as accredited delegates from any of these crafts will have a seat and voice in the convention, but will not have a vote unless they are empowered to install their local as a part of this new industrial council. And we feel that if they come so empowered it will of necessity imply that they will sever their connections with the parent organization, because we can hardly see how they can take a stand of holding dual membership in both the Industrial Workers of the World and the A. F. of L. We do not know at this time how many of them will come, but we are at least going to make that effort, because we think that through those educational efforts among the organizations which are just as strong down there as they are in Chicago, that those fellows will finally come and be with us.

DEL. PARKS: Are they associated together now in such an educational program, the unions in Arizona?

DEL. RYAN: All the unions in the mining industry.

DEL. LINGENFELTER: Then I can't find a place down there.

DEL. RYAN: I thought you understood that clearly. All of our local unions pay a per capita tax of ten cents per month for each member in good standing. That goes into the general fund which is used strictly for propaganda purposes, for our organizers in reaching them. We have only got an income of \$233.50 a month. Small as that is, we manage to have one to three organizers in the field more or less of the time. We generally have one. We have two out now, and next month we will have a Spanish organizer. We have got an Austrian and English speaking organizer at this time. The Spanish organizer will take the field next month. Their instructions are to go to every local union in the mining industry. Wherever they can get fifteen or twenty men to listen they are to explain industrial unionism, and we consider that as doing just as much service for industrial unionism as though they were working in the mining industry.

DEL. PARKS: Mr. Chairman, I would like to state now that the Montana State Federation of Labor, prior to the convention that they held a year ago, was an organization that functioned only along those lines that Bro. Ryan intends this district council shall function. The Montana State Federation of Labor was a federation of all labor organizations in the state, whether Western Federation or not, and they paid into a central treasury five cents per member per quarter, or twenty cents a year. That was the revenue of the Montana State Federation of Labor. After the I. W. W. convention a year ago, Mr. Fairgrieve goes back before this Montana State Federation of Labor and captured that organization and turned it into an organization with power to issue charters to all kinds of labor organizations, I suppose, and he has been issuing charters to dual organizations in the state of Montana. That is where he springs into the labor movement as the president of the Montana State Federation of Labor, criticising and fighting against the Industrial Workers of the World. The Montana State Federation of Labor was practically filling the field, but after the I. W. W. convention they thought the I. W. W. was going to fill the field. The Western Federation of Miners, and the Smeltermen included, neglected their opportunity and practically withdrew from the Montana State Federation of Labor and allowed Fairgrieve to carry it off bag and baggage. If they had stayed in that Montana State Federation of Labor they would have had power to vote Mr. Fairgrieve out, and wouldn't have had the charter-issuing proposition, and we would have had no such organization as we have today, and led by Fairgrieve in Montana. Now, Bro. Ryan's proposition, it seems, is intended to carry out in Arizona the policy that should have been pursued in the state of Montana.

DEL. RYAN. I want to say to Del. Parks and every other delegate on this floor that Arizona has not yet produced a Fairgrieve. (Applause.)

DEL. KINNEALLY: I agree with Bro. French that the paragraph which he read, and which I will read so that all may better understand it, covers the ground: "Industrial councils for the purpose of establishing general solidarity in a given district"—it don't say whether it will cover an area of twenty-five or twenty-five hundred miles—"may be organized, and shall be composed of delegates from not less than five local industrial or local recruiting unions, and shall maintain communication between such district and general headquarters." Now, I see no necessity, when I read that, for establishing any other provision. I believe that provision covers what we are trying to get at.

DEL. RYAN: That provision should cover all cases exactly so that we can get a strict definition from this convention of the word "district."

DEL. FRENCH: My understanding of that as I wrote those words was that the district should be a given locality assigned to the council by the General Executive Board in its negotiations with the parts requiring a district council charter. That district may be one city or it may be a territory that included fifty cities.

DEL. RYAN. That would be all right with that interpretation, and would be perfectly satisfactory. I want you to understand that it is different altogether from industrial councils. It must necessarily be so in its nature and makeup, an industrial council for New York city, that it is merely composed of delegates from locals that meet, say once a week to transact the affairs of the local unions which they represent. But with our organization we want to have our affairs managed practically the same as this Industrial Workers of the World. As the central organization we will hold a convention and everything like that once a year and elect delegates from our local unions to attend the convention. But between convention the affairs of the organization are now and will be in the future administered by the Executive Board of this organization, including the Secretary-Treasurer.

DEL. FRENCH: It is simply an industrial council fitted into the conditions which prevail in that particular district.

DEL. RYAN: Since I am clear that the district means that and also means territory, the Territory of Arizona for instance, if you want to call that a district, with that explanation, well and good. That is all we want.

DEL. TULLAR: I think that matter could easily be arranged and have that understood by inserting it as the law that when the charter for the district council is applied for, that the delegates applying for that charter should specify the actual territory they wished to cover, to be for one city or two cities or a county or a state; specify the territory they wish to cover, and the charter will be granted for that territory, providing that territory does not conflict with a charter previously granted to some other organization.

DEL. KINNEALLY: Mr. Chairman and brothers, inasmuch as we have a provision covering the request of Delegate Ryan from the Mining Department, if there is no objection I will withdraw my amendment to the recommendation of the committee, and no doubt the committee will be satisfied to withdraw and let that go, as the provision covers it.

DEL. LINGENFELTER: How about these A. F. of L. and independent unions in that district? Will this clause or amendment cover that case? It does not only imply the I. W. W. locals and the organization of the Mining Department locals of that district, but it also includes independent unions and A. F. of L. unions that are desirous to continue in this district council, if you please.

DEL. RYAN: I tell you what we propose to do. Assuming that we hold our convention November 12th and that the General Executive Board, if we accept the constitution here, gives us a charter, we will then be composed of all the local unions in the mining industry and seven, eight or possibly nine locals which have been chartered by the General Executive Board, laundry workers, bartenders, store clerks and everything like that. We will be all in that organization. They will be all members of the Industrial Workers of the World. When our organizer goes to a place where they have before this time been in affiliation with the American Federation of Labor, he will

meet them, on the street, in the halls or wherever he can get at them, and if there is sufficient revolutionary spirit in them to warrant creating a local we will then take the matter in hand, communicate with the General Executive Board of the Industrial Workers of the World and secure a charter for them. Under the provision of the resolution which was adopted the other day, if they can't do any better they will charter them as a craft union until such time as they can properly be placed in the Industrial organization. Then when they get this charter they will also become affiliated with this industrial council, and then we will reach out and get more and more, and do the best we can along these lines.

DEL. MARKLEY: Why not provide that a district is allowed to designate its own territory as conditions may demand?

DEL. RYAN: I heartily agree with that. The district council, it will be readily understood, would want everything in their territory. That being so, there will be no kick.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection to withdrawing the amendment to the committee's report? If not, the Chair will declare it has been withdrawn by unanimous consent.

DEL. McMULLEN: What is this on?

THE CHAIRMAN: This is on the council for the Arizona State Union. The Secretary will read the report of the committee.

DEL. KINNEALLY: The report of the committee is that we recommend that the matter be referred to the General Executive Board to be acted upon jointly with the administration of the Mining Department. Now, we find that there is a provision already in the constitution adopted here yesterday or the day before, covering that very identical request of the Mining Department through Bro. Ryan, and consequently it is unnecessary because it is covered.

DEL. McMULLEN: The report of the committee is rejected, is it not?

DEL. RYAN: Yes.

DEL. McMULLEN: Rejected on the ground that it is covered?

DEL. RYAN: Yes.

DEL. McMULLEN: I have no objection.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered. The hour of ten o'clock has arrived.

DEL. REID: Mr. Chairman, a point of information. I am led to believe that ex-President Sherman is using the offices——

(Objection to the remarks was heard.)

DEL. REID: All right, Mr. Chairman.

#### ELECTION OF OFFICERS.

THE CHAIRMAN: Nominations are in order for officers; for General Secretary-Treasurer.

DEL. MARKLEY: I rise to nominate Bro. Trautmann. (Seconded)

THE CHAIRMAN: Bro. Trautmann has been nominated. Any further nominations?

DEL. TULLAR: "Fellow Worker;" I beg your pardon.

DEL. MUSKOVITZ: I nominate Fellow Worker Riordan.

THE CHAIRMAN: Fellow Worker Riordan has been nominated. Are there any further nominations?

DEL. RIORDAN: I wish to decline the nomination.

THE CHAIRMAN: Riordan declines.

DEL. FRENCH: I move that the nominations close.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any further nominations?

DEL. ABBOTT: Then I nominate Bro. McMullen of Montana.

THE CHAIRMAN: McMullen has been placed in nomination. Are there any further nominations?

DEL. FRENCH: I move that the nominations close. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been regularly moved and seconded that the nominations close, with the names of Trautmann and McMullen.

DEL. FRUEH: The constitution says that there must be three nominations.

THE CHAIRMAN: No.

DEL. FRUEH: And presented by this body for a referendum vote.

THE CHAIRMAN: The constitution specifies, delegate, that the three having the highest vote will be submitted. It does not say that there must be three.

DEL. FRUEH: Bro. Chairman, how can you close the nominations on two names when three must be presented having the highest number of votes?

THE CHAIRMAN: The constitution simply means that if there are a number running, the three of that number that run that have the highest number of votes must be presented, but it does not mean that there must be three presented. Are there any objections to closing the nominations?

DEL. DUNCAN: If the constitution provides that three shall be submitted we should really have three submitted. I raise that point of order.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair has already ruled on that, Bro. Duncan.

DEL. DUNCAN: Then I appeal from the decision of the Chair.

THE CHAIRMAN: The constitution does not say that three must be submitted.

DEL. DUNCAN: But it presupposes—

THE CHAIRMAN: But it says that whenever there are over three or a number running, that the three which receive the highest votes must be submitted.

DEL. DUNCAN: I appeal from the decision of the Chair.

A DELEGATE: There is no second to that.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair would suggest to Bro. Duncan to save time, if he desires three names to go on the ballot, that he can nominate one before the nominations close.

DEL. REID: I nominate Del. Ryan.

DEL. RYAN: Del. Ryan declines.

DEL. DUNCAN: I nominate Del. Markley.

THE CHAIRMAN: Bro. Markley has been placed in nomination. Are there any further nominations?

DEL. PETRIELLA: I nominate Bro. St. John.

THE CHAIRMAN (Del. St. John): Bro. St. John declines.

DEL. GOLDBERG: I nominate Del. Augustine.

THE CHAIRMAN: Del. Augustine has been nominated. Are there no any further nominations? If not, and there are no objections on the part of any delegate, the Chair will declare the nominations closed.

DEL. SIMS: Mr. Chairman, who are running?

THE CHAIRMAN: The Secretary will read the nominees.

SEC. EDWARDS: Trautmann, McMullen, Markley, Augustine.

DEL. AUGUSTINE: Is it yet time to decline a nomination?

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair has not closed the nominations yet.

DEL. AUGUSTINE: All right. Then I decline.

DEL. HAVER: I would like to nominate Bro. French.

DEL. FRENCH: Bro. French respectfully declines.

THE CHAIRMAN: Del. French has been placed in nomination.

DEL. FRENCH: I decline.

THE CHAIRMAN: Del. French declines. Are there any further that decline?

DEL. SIMS: Who are the nominees?

THE CHAIRMAN: The Secretary will read the nominations.

SEC. EDWARDS: Trautmann, McMullen and Markley.

DEL. MOORE: I nominate Del. Foote.

A DELEGATE: I nominate Del. Fox.

DEL. FOX: I decline.

DEL. SIMS: I wish to put in nomination Del. Fischer.

DEL. FISCHER: I respectfully decline.

DEL. DUNCAN: I nominate Del. McKnight.

THE CHAIRMAN: Del. McKnight has been placed in nomination. Are there any further nominations? If not, and there are no objections, the Chair will declare the nominations closed. It is so ordered.

DEL. DE LEON: Will the Secretary read the nominations? I request that the Secretary read the nominations that stand. We don't know now; so many were nominated.

SEC. EDWARDS: The nominations are: Trautmann, McMullen, Markley, McKnight.

DEL. DE LEON: Mr. Chairman, if the Chair thinks I ought to make a motion I will put it in the shape of a motion. I do not think a motion is necessary. I suggest that the names of the candidates be posted up and that the Secretary proceed to call the roll, and as the delegates are named the number of ballots they are entitled to cast be accredited to the candidates for whom they vote. (Seconded.) If it is necessary to make that as a motion I will do so, but that is the way we proceeded on the election of the Committee on Constitution.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any objections on the part of any delegate to the open voting for the candidates? The Chair hears none and it is so ordered, and we will proceed that way.

#### SECEDING DELEGATES.

DEL. MAHONEY: I objected yesterday morning and this morning to the election of officers until the report is submitted in its entirety of the work of this organization. My position being overruled at this time I want to serve notice on this convention now that I am through with it. You can call it bolting if you like. You can interpret it as you see fit, but I have no further deliberations in this body. I would further like to state that I expect to submit my doings to the constituency that I represent, a constituency which I believe is a business organization, and a constituency that if it assembled in convention would not permit a mode of procedure of this kind, and I want to serve notice on each and every one of you at this time that I am through with this convention, and to say that I expect any other delegate who believes in a fair and square deal, that they should be through with it also. (Hisses.)

A DELEGATE: Good-bye.

DEL. McMULLEN: I want to say as one of the delegates representing the Mining Department that the acting president of that organization, Mahoney, has expressed my thoughts. I want to further say that I did not express my sentiments alone when the gentlemen insisted on forming this convention contrary to the constitution. I believe those of us who aim to live up now to the constitution and laws of the organization have no consideration, in my judgment, and I may do the people who sent me here an injury by staying here any longer and accepting their money. Therefore I now depart.

DEL. FOX: Before the gentleman leaves I would like to ask him why he refused to serve on the Auditing Committee. Let him go down on record if he wants to.

DEL. McMULLEN: What do you want?

DEL. FOX: Why did you refuse to serve on the Auditing Committee?

DEL. McMULLEN: Just one minute and I will tell you. I called that Auditing Committee together at 7 o'clock in the evening. You and I and a few others were there. The Secretary-Treasurer of the organization never showed up at all. We remained out in the hall there in that building on the fifth floor, and proceeded to form our committee. You called the committee together the next time, and I was there; you recall that?

DEL. FOX: I recall it, yes.

DEL. McMULLEN: That was Sunday morning. I was there. There were two others besides ourselves. Now, I am going to say right here as to why I did not show up. I will tell you; I would have nothing more to do with them.

DEL. FOX: They have gone home.

(Del. McMullen here left the convention.)

DEL. FRENCH: A point of order. This man has withdrawn, and I hold that it is out of order for Del. Fox to be asking him any questions.

DEL. FOX: We have a right to his reasons.

DEL. FRENCH: He has already said enough.

DEL. HENDRICKS: Mr. Chairman, the organization which I represent is the Butte Pitmen's Union of Butte, Montana. I wish to state that the acting president of the Western Federation of Miners has voiced my sentiment on this proposition. I have insisted and tried in every way I could try to get a financial statement of the business of this organization. It was one of the special instructions from the organization which I represent, to be sure and get one. As yet there has been no attempt, it looks to me, to give this convention a financial statement of the business. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I am going to leave the convention.

DELEGATES: Good-bye.

(Del. Hendricks then left the convention; also Del. McDonald.)

DEL. MARKLEY: I wish to withdraw from the Secretary-Treasurer race.

DEL. DE LEON: I would like to know who are the candidates. Who have withdrawn? McMullen and Markley?

SEC. EDWARDS: McMullen and Markley.

DEL. DUNCAN: I rise to, a point of order. The constitution provides for submitting three names to a referendum, and in order to have these three we should now be open to nominations.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair will rule that your point of order is not well taken.

DEL. DUNCAN: I appeal from the decision of the Chair.

#### TRANSFER OF SECEDERS' VOTES.

DEL. RYAN: I want to raise a point of order before we have a roll call.

THE CHAIRMAN: State your point.

DEL. RYAN: Del. McMullen and Del. McDonald have bolted this convention. At the 14th annual convention of the Western Federation of Miners there were four delegates and four alternates elected. Del. Heslewood was elected as an alternate, and therefore I ask at this

time that he be placed in a position to cast the votes of one of those delegates.

THE CHAIRMAN: It strikes the Chair that way. If there are no objections the alternate of the Western Federation of Miners will cast the vote of one of the delegates who have left.

DEL. PETRIELLA: Has the Credentials Committee received the credentials of that alternate?

THE CHAIRMAN: Certainly. Well, I don't know.

DEL. PETRIELLA: If those credentials are not handed to the convention I protest against that alternate voting for the regular delegate.

DEL. SHENKAN: I would like to know if it can be shown by the proceedings of the convention of the Western Federation of Miners that Del. Heslewood was elected as alternate.

DEL. RYAN: Yes, he was elected.

DEL. SHENKAN: That ought to be quite sufficient.

DEL. FRENCH: Further than that, Del. Heslewood has cast the vote already as alternate for Bro. St. John in the afternoon. I think that proves conclusively that he is an alternate.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair will rule that Del. Heslewood can cast the vote of one of the delegates.

#### ELECTION OF OFFICERS (Resumed). -

THE CHAIRMAN: Sec. Trautmann and McKnight are the nominees and there is an appeal against the decision.

A roll call was asked on the appeal.

DEL. KLEESE: I move that the appeal be laid on the table.

Objections were heard from the hall.

THE CHAIRMAN: Call the roll. A delegate has appealed from the decision of the Chair. The vote now occurs on the appeal. If you vote to sustain the Chair you vote yes. If you vote to sustain the appeal you vote no.

DEL. SCHWEINBURG: What is the appeal?

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair ruled that it is not necessary to have three nominees to the office; that the constitution did not compel the submission of three nominees for a referendum unless there were three nominated receiving the highest number of votes.

The roll call resulted: Total vote, 450; Yes, 438; No, 12.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair is sustained. Proceed to ballot on the nominees for Secretary-Treasurer.

A DELEGATE: Roll call demanded.

THE CHAIRMAN: All right. The nominees are Trautmann and McKnight.

The roll was called and the vote resulted: Total vote, 440; Trautmann, 438; McKnight, 2.

#### ASST. GENERAL SECRETARY-TREASURER.

THE CHAIRMAN: Nominations are next in order for Assistant General Secretary-Treasurer.

DEL. TULLAR: I nominate Bro. Riordan.

DEL. MARKLEY: I rise to nominate Fellow-Worker Foote of Wichita, Kansas.

(Del. Riordan declined.)

DEL. McCUE: I nominate Comrade Kinneally of New York,

DEL. ABBOTT: I nominate Comrade Duncan.

DEL. LINGENFELTER: I nominate Del. Forberg.

(Del. Forberg declined.)

DEL. LUNDY: I nominate Del. Cox.



DEL. PARKS: It will be in order to nominate a person not on the floor of the convention, will it?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

DEL. PARKS: I nominate Bro. M. P. Haggerty of Butte.

DEL. ABBOTT: I object. He is not a delegate to the convention.

DEL. PARKS: The Chairman has ruled that it would be in order to nominate anybody that belongs to the I. W. W. I believe he is correct.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any other nominations?

(It was moved that the nominations be closed.)

DEL. SIMS: I nominate Bro. Fischer.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any further nominations? If there are no further nominations and there are no objections the Chair will close the nominations.

A DELEGATE: I nominate Bro. Augustine.

DEL. COX: I desire to decline the nomination.

A DELEGATE: Who are the nominees?

SEC. EDWARDS: Foote, Kinneally, Riordan—

DEL. RIORDAN: No, the stenographer has already recorded the statement that I wish to decline.

THE CHAIRMAN: Del. Riordan declines.

SEC. EDWARDS: Foote, Kinneally, Duncan, Haggerty, Fischer.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any objections to closing the nominations?

DEL. FISCHER: I respectfully decline.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any objections to closing the nominations?

DEL. PARKS: I want to ask as to the action on my nomination.

THE CHAIRMAN: The nomination stands.

DEL. MARKLEY: I would rise to ask Bro. Parks a question. Are you sure, have you any certainty that Bro. Haggerty would accept if he were here?

DEL. PARKS: I am not sure, but we can submit the three names of the nominees, and if Bro. Haggerty don't want to he will have time in the 90 days to decline, and if he does he can accept. We can vote on the three names. We don't have to force it upon him. He will have 90 days.

DEL. FRUEH: I object to having any men nominated who are absent.

THE CHAIRMAN: I don't understand what you say. The Chair didn't catch what you said.

DEL. DUNCAN: He objects to anyone being nominated who is absent.

THE CHAIRMAN: There is no constitutional provision which debar anyone who is a member of the Industrial Workers of the World from nomination. The nominations are not restricted to the delegates on the floor. If there is no objection the Chair will declare the nominations closed.

DEL. AUGUSTINE: I understand I have been nominated. I wish to decline.

DEL. ABBOTT: I wish to ask Bro. Parks if he knows that Bro. Haggerty will accept the nomination.

THE CHAIRMAN: Bro. Parks says he does not know, but Bro. Haggerty will have an opportunity to decline before the vote is submitted.

DEL. FORBERG: I would like to place in nomination Bro. Lawson of Local Union Uo. 85.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any further nominations? If not, the Chair will declare the nominations closed.

DEL. ROGERS: I would like to say that I would be glad to have a chance to vote for Bro. Lawson myself, but I spoke to him in regard to this same matter and he said he would not serve.

DEL. RYAN: I think that is right, Bro. Chairman. I have spoken to Fellow-Worker Lawson also, and he says his business is of such a nature at this time that he could not even entertain the idea of being placed in nomination for office.

DEL. SCHWEINBURG: I nominate Comrade Ryan.

DEL. RYAN: I decline.

THE CHAIRMAN: If there are no further nominations—

DEL. FORBERG: I would like to nominate Bro. St. John.

THE CHAIRMAN (Del. St. John): Del. St. John will decline. Are there any further nominations? If not, the Chair will declare the nominations closed. It is so ordered.

DEL. DE LEON: Who are the nominees?

THE CHAIRMAN: The Secretary will read them.

SEC. EDWARDS: Foote, Kinneally, Duncan, Haggerty.

DEL. DE LEON: I desire to go on record as seconding the nomination of E. J. Foote.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called on Assistant General Secretary-Treasurer.

DEL. MOORE: I would like to ask a question. My question is this: If Haggerty declines does that give Duncan a chance for the referendum?

The vote resulted as follows: Total vote, 460; Kinneally, 179; Foote, 133; Haggerty, 128; Duncan, 20.

THE CHAIRMAN: The ballot has resulted in the names of Fellow-Workers Kinneally, Foote and Haggerty being elected to go on the referendum ballot.

DEL. ABBOTT: In the event of Bro. Haggerty declining will Duncan's name go on the ballot?

THE CHAIRMAN: The chair will say that in the event that Bro. Haggerty declines, Bro. Duncan's name will go on the ballot.

DEL. McKNIGHT: I wish to instruct the Secretary of this convention to strike my name from the list of candidates for General Secretary-Treasurer and let Bro. Trautmann go out on the referendum to the I. W. W. as the unanimous choice of this convention for that office.

THE CHAIRMAN: If there is no objection on the part of any delegate present it is so ordered.

A DELEGATE: What is it?

THE CHAIRMAN: Del. McKnight requested that his name be taken from the list of nominees on the referendum and that Bro. Trautmann go out to the membership as the unanimous choice of this convention.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: I would object as one member.

#### ELECTION OF GENERAL EXECUTIVE BOARD.

THE CHAIRMAN: Nominations are now in order to elect five members of the General Executive Board.

DEL. MARKLEY: I rise to place in nomination Fellow-Worker St. John.

DEL. FRENCH: I nominate Heslewood.

DEL. DE LEON: I rise to second the nomination of St. John and to nominate Maichele of the Metal Workers of Schenectady.

DEL. RYAN: I nominate Del. Eugene Fischer. (Seconded.)

DEL. ROBINSON: I nominate Del. Cox.

DEL. JOHNSON: I nominate Del. Fox.

DEL. LINGENFELTER: I nominate A. S. Smith of New Orleans.

DEL. AUGUSTINE: A point of order. Smith is a manufacturer and not a wage worker.

DEL. LINGENFELTER: Then I withdraw the nomination.

DEL. FISCHER: I wish to ask for information. This Executive Board is elected by this body. I want to know if anybody outside of those delegates can be nominated.

DEL. SCHWEINBURG: As I understand Comrade Fischer, he said that those officers were elected by this body. I say no. The constitution states distinctly that the General Secretary-Treasurer, Assistant General Secretary-Treasurer and then the General Executive Board shall be composed of one member of each industrial department. They have to go to the general vote.

DEL. PINKERTON: No, they are elected on the floor. I place in nomination T. J. Cole of Blue Island Local 17, Transportation.

DEL. PARKS: Mr. Chairman, I want to rise to make a nomination. It may be that Bro. Haggerty will decline for Assistant General Secretary-Treasurer. I am going to place him in nomination also for a member of the General Executive Board. He may not be in such a position that he can leave Butte. I think Butte ought to have a member on the General Executive Board and we can place on it no better man in the state of Montana than M. P. Haggerty, and if he does decline, which he probably will, to be a candidate for the office of Asst. Secretary-Treasurer, he will no doubt accept the election to the G. E. B. Therefore I will place Haggerty's name before the convention for that office. (Seconded. Applause.)

DEL. FITZGERALD: I rise to nominate a man that has been in this movement a long time, and a man that has always hewed straight to the line, although I won't say in this body that he is a class-conscious man, but I will say this, that in all his dealings with the labor movement he has always been fair. I have seen him standing alone against the majority of the board, against the majority of what was supposed to be gag law, and I feel it to be my duty this morning to place in nomination William Hickey of the Transportation Department.

THE CHAIRMAN: Fellow-Worker Hickey is nominated.

Del. Johnson was nominated.

DEL. FRENCH: I heard the name of Cole placed in nomination. As there have been two Coles in this convention, one spelling his name Kohl, this delegate over here, and another whose name is spelled I think either Coll or Cole. I want to know which one has been nominated.

DEL. PINKERTON: T. J. C-o-l-e.

DEL. BOHLING: I nominate Del. Riordan. (Del. Riordan declined.)

DEL. SCHWEINBURG: I nominate Del. Albert Ryan.

THE CHAIRMAN: He has been placed in nomination.

DEL. RYAN: I wish to decline.

THE CHAIRMAN: Del. Ryan declines. Are there any further nominations?

DEL. DE LEON: I desire to know whether Heslewood has been nominated.

THE CHAIRMAN: He has been nominated.

DEL. ABBOTT: For fear Haggerty declines the nomination I place in nomination Bro. Parks. In case Haggerty declines I want Parks on the board.

DEL. PARKS: Mr. Chairman, I will decline the nomination for the position because I am not competent.

THE CHAIRMAN: Del. Parks declines.

DEL. JOHNSON: I wish to decline the nomination.

THE CHAIRMAN: Del. Johnson declines. Are there any further nominations?

DEL. ROGERS: I nominate McCue.

DEL. McCUE: I decline, as I am not competent.

DEL. BROWN: I nominate Del. Haver of New York.

DEL. LUNDY: I place in nomination Del. Reid from Toronto, Canada. (Del. Reid declined.)

DEL. HAVER: I nominate Del. Holmes. (Del. Holmes declined.)

DEL. FRUER: I nominate Del. Phillip Veal. (Del. Veal declined.)

DEL. AUGUSTINE: I rise to nominate Bro. Brown of Nevada. (Del. Brown declined.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Bro. Brown declines. Are there any further nominations? If not, the Chair will declare the nominations closed. It is so ordered.

DEL. PETRIELLA: Mr. Chairman, I regret that I cannot help but object to the nomination of Bro. St. John and Bro. Heslewood. They are both members of the Mining Department, and a provision in the constitution has been made that the Mining Department is going to have one person in the G. E. B. That member will be elected by that department, and I think it would be wrong to the whole membership of the Industrial Workers of the World outside of the Mining Department when we take two members of the board in that department.

DEL. RYAN: I believe we are trying to keep as close to the revolutionary lines as we can, and I cannot see any objections just because I happen to come from the Mining Department as long as I represent and have represented honestly the revolutionary element that is in the Mining Department.

DEL. PETRIELLA: I wish to go on record as making that objection.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Secretary will post the names of the nominees.

DEL. MOORE: A resolution that has been introduced says:

"Whereas, Since there is but one department in existence;

"Resolved, That the General Executive Board the coming year shall consist of a member of that department, the Mining Department, and five additional members elected at large from this convention from various parts of the country, besides the General Secretary-Treasurer."

DEL. REID: Mr. Chairman, I don't want to be on the Executive Board, but as I am from Canada perhaps it might be proper to allow my name to be on the roster of nominees. I am, I believe, the only one in the convention from Canada, and I will allow my name to be used.

DEL. LUNDY: Heslewood is from Canada.

DEL. RICHTER: I move that each delegate be provided with a slip of paper and write down five names that he votes for, and when his name is called he hand that in or read it off.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair will ask the delegate to hand the slips around. (Referring to Del. Richter.)

DEL. DE LEON: Mr. Chairman, may this take the place of the motion that I made before? I think I made a suggestion before that

the roll be called and each delegate who rises give his name and the number of votes for the different candidates. That would be simpler than going down and handing them in.

THE CHAIRMAN: Each delegate may pick out the five that he votes for. Each delegate is entitled to vote for five nominees, and you will proceed to call your choice of the five when your name is called.

The vote was taken for members of the General Executive Board, resulting as follows: St. John, 444; Maichele, 433; Fischer, 390; Heslewood, 322; Cole, 286; Hickey, 138; Haggerty, 130; Haver, 57; Cox, 47.

Del. Cox was called to the chair.

THE CHAIRMAN pro tem: Fellow delegates, you have by your votes elected St. John, Maichele, Heslewood, Fischer and Cole. The hour of adjournment, 12 o'clock, having arrived, if there are no objections the convention will adjourn to one o'clock.

DEL. SCHWEINBURG: One o'clock. The constitution says here that the General Executive Board for the coming year shall consist of a member from the Mining Department and five additional members.

DEL. TULLAR: Well, there are the five additional members that you have just now elected. They will elect a delegate later on.

Adjourned till one o'clock P. M.

#### AFTERNOON SESSION—OCT. 2.

Chairman St. John called the convention to order at one o'clock, pursuant to adjournment.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will hear the balance of the report of the Constitution Committee.

DEL. MOSKOVITZ: Mr. Chairman, a point of order. Is there no election of editor of the "Industrial Worker?"

THE CHAIRMAN: There is no provision for the editor in the constitution.

#### MEMBERSHIP IN PURE AND SIMPLE UNIONS.

Del. Kinneally resumed the report of the Committee on Constitution, as follows:

DEL. KINNEALLY: Proposition presented by Del. George S. Holmes, seconded by Del. William E. McCue:

"Moved, that the following clause be inserted in the constitution: No member of the I. W. W. shall be an officer in a pure and simple union."

We recommend that this be adopted.

DEL. KLEESE: I move its adoption. (Seconded.)

A DELEGATE: I move to concur.

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been regularly moved and seconded that the recommendation of the Committee on Constitution be concurred in on this matter. You have heard the motion; are you ready for the question? Are there any objections to granting unanimous consent to concurrence in this report? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

#### GENERAL MEMBERSHIP.

DEL. KINNEALLY (report continued): The propositions that we now present are propositions that the committee do not concur in:

"Resolved, that workers wishing to support industrial unionism may be allowed to join any industrial union in a locality, providing no mixed local exists in said locality."

DEL. KINNEALLY: That was presented by Del. Kleese. Not concurred in by the committee. The committee recommended that it be not concurred in.

DEL. KLEESE: Would any explanation be in order?

THE CHAIRMAN: A motion would be in order first to concur in the report of the committee.

DEL. LINGENFELTER: I move that we concur in the recommendation of the committee. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded that the report of the committee on this matter be concurred in. You have heard the motion; are you ready for the question?

DEL. KLEESE: Bro. Chairman and fellow workers, the reason for putting that in is this: In organizing in the West we run across towns where there is a lumber mill, or just one industry in the town, and the thing to be done there would be to organize that as an industrial union, and under the constitution no workers can belong to the I. W. W. in that locality unless they belong to the lumber industry. For that reason I put in that resolution. Now, it is not going to stop the revolution if that is not accepted, and any place that I organize a union and there are members who should belong in a mixed local in a locality of that kind, I am going to put them in that local. But I just put that in to have the constitution straight and right to the mark.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any further remarks?

DEL. HOLMES: I want to say that I don't agree with the resolution. As a matter of fact it seems to me it is almost impossible to find a locality where there is any Industrial Workers organized without finding a mixed local, a recruiting local. Well, suppose there is not. Suppose there is a trade local and a man goes there that is not eligible for that trade local, he will find other people in the same position as himself, and he can go to work and no doubt will find enough for a mixed local. I think that would be the correct way to do it, and I think this report should be concurred in.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any objections to granting unanimous consent to concurrence in this report of the committee?

DEL. KLEESE: Here is one.

THE CHAIRMAN: Del. Kleese voting in the negative. The Chair will declare the motion carried.

#### REDUCING MEMBERSHIP OF MIXED LOCALS.

DEL. KINNEALLY (report of Constitution Committee continued): Resolution presented by the same delegate, Comrade Kleese:

"Resolved, That no mixed local may be reduced from a higher number to less than a quorum by consigning members of the industrial unions to a trade just organized."

The committee recommends that it be not concurred in.

DEL. SHENKAN: I move to concur in the report of the committee. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded that the report of the committee on this resolution be concurred in. You have heard the motion; are you ready for the question?

DEL. KLEESE: Bro. President, the reason I put that in was for the same purpose. If we have a locality where there are say fifty men organized in a mixed local and we decide to organize according to industries and pull out fifteen men, and then another fifteen, and then another, that will leave only five in the mixed local. That won't be enough for a quorum and you can't transact business and take in new members with five if you live up to the constitution. Now, I don't care whether that is adopted or not. Whenever that occasion occurs where I am, I am not going to live up to the constitution.

**THE CHAIRMAN:** Are there any objections to granting unanimous consent to the adoption of the committee's report in this matter? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

#### INITIATING A REFERENDUM.

**DEL. KINNEALLY** (continuing report): From Local 222, Spokane: "Resolved, That any local union, by its majority vote, seconded by the majority of votes of four other locals, may at any time initiate a referendum vote in the I. W. W., either in the general organization or in the department most concerned."

Not concurred in.

**DEL DE LEON:** I move you that we concur with the recommendation, and if the motion is seconded I wish to speak. (Seconded.)

**THE CHAIRMAN:** It has been moved and seconded that the report of the committee in this matter be concurred in.

**DEL. DE LEON:** The reason why the committee recommends adversely on this subject is this: We have provided for a general vote of the membership to be ordered within thirty days after the convention adjourns. We have provided that that vote shall close thirty days later.

**DEL. RICHTER:** Sixty.

**DEL. DE LEON:** One moment. Subsequently by amendment it was extended to sixty. In other words, about eight months from the day when we close the convention meets again. It seems to your committee a superfluous expenditure of time to have referendums taken within those short months. If the convention were to meet every four years or there were plenty of space between the close of the referendum on our actions and the next convention some provision would be wise in the line suggested by the recommendation of Del. Duncan. But seeing that so short a time elapses, it seems like inviting changes upon changes and changes again. Then also you must remember that we adopted a rule that no amendment to the constitution is to be made—is to be considered by the next convention except such amendment has been in the hands of the G. E. B. and printed in the "Industrial Worker" at least one month before. So that in fact would leave seven months for the initiation of referendums. In view of all this we thought it was better to let us have eight months' rest to digest what we have instead of initiating changes.

**DEL. DUNCAN:** Bro. Chairman, it seems to me that is not a good line of reasoning, to reason that because we are deprived of the referendum for a certain length of time we should deprive ourselves of it for the rest of the time also. Bro. De Leon says that there is only seven months remaining for the initiation of referendums. Therefore I say that we ought to reserve that right to the membership. We certainly want to initiate referendums now and again, if we are going to have a referendum at all. If we don't provide some way by which a referendum can be initiated when there is sufficient incentive for it, what does that referendum mean to us? Have we or have we not the referendum? The constitution makes a provision for the calling of a referendum immediately after the convention, and to be taken within sixty days just as Bro. De Leon says, but on specific subjects. It is on the approval or disapproval of our actions here. Now, then, we may want to call a referendum on some other subject. We don't know what is going to come up, and if we are going to remain a democratic body I believe we have got to reserve this right to ourselves. The constituencies that have sent us here, the majority of them, I believe, would insist upon it, and if they found that we were taking any legislative

steps to take that right away from them that they think they are going to have, there would be a big howl go up right away, and I am not sure but it would militate seriously to the detriment of the Industrial Workers of the World. I believe that the Industrial Workers of the World will live and grow and become a real working class movement, but if it is going to do anything of the kind I believe it has got to be a democracy first of all. Bro. De Leon says the referendum is provided for during the first sixty days after we adjourn. True, on certain subjects it is, but I do not think that would be a good reason for depriving us of it for the next seven months. I know it is provided that we must file the motions that we are going to bring before the convention at least a month before the convention convenes. I consented to that measure and voted for it. I believe that it was brought up because it seemed necessary and expedient in order to expedite the affairs of the convention. But should we on that account deprive ourselves of the right to referendums on any other subjects, on a great variety of subjects if the need may be that may arise during the whole year? I would not take it that the referendum being called for and began during the sixty days after we adjourn would make it impossible for us to call for another referendum before that referendum were completed, if there were a reason for it. If some officer of this organization should prove himself a traitor to the Industrial Workers of the World shortly after the convention had adjourned, why should we not have the right to depose him? And the only logical way of going about that would be by referendum vote. We do not know what the G. E. B. is going to do. That is only a very small body. We are a large constituency, taking all the country over. Five men to represent us, and no more, is not enough. If we are not going to have more representation than that, we certainly should hold this right of the referendum, and if we do not have the means of initiating it, the means of ruling as well as the warrant to rule, we certainly don't have it. The mere stating of the fact of the referendum vote being taken under certain conditions does not make us a democratic body. A democratic body has the power and the right to rule all the time, and I am against the committee's report.

DEL. KLEESE: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to take up much of the time of the convention, but I am in favor of the resolution of Bro. Duncan. We should at all times be open to the initiative and referendum. I disagree with Comrade De Leon in stating that we should take a rest. There is no rest for the revolutionists. Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty. There is no time for the revolutionist to go to sleep, and I think that this being our first real convention controlled only by the revolutionary element, we should go on record by our constitution adopting the initiative and referendum so that any member of the organization can take the same advantage of law-making as we have had here at the convention.

DEL. LINGENFELTER: Mr. Chairman, do I understand that resolution to mean made by one local and seconded by four? Is that correct?

DEL. KLEESE: Yes.

DEL. LINGENFELTER: Now, we have the Mining Department, representing 22,000 men. We have, I am told, 64,000. We have in the central part of the state of Illinois five locals. These five locals would not represent more than 100 men. Do I understand correctly that you wish to give those five locals the right at any time to plunge this organization into the enormous expense of a referendum at will? That is the position you put us into. That is exactly the position. If you



are going to have a referendum let us have safeguards around it so that a pack of fools cannot be everlastingly rushing into a referendum and throwing the organization into turmoil.

DEL. DUNCAN: I do not think that the expense of submitting a referendum to the membership of the Industrial Workers of the World is so enormous compared with other expenses of ruling. I think it is very small. In the constituency that I represent there is quite an extensive sentiment prevailing to the effect that we should do all our business by referendum because it would be cheaper. It is contended that it would be much cheaper to take a referendum vote on the various questions that are being decided, without holding any conventions at all, and there is a great deal back of that contention. I think conventions are a good thing in some particulars. We can debate things more thoroughly than we can by referendum, but at the same time we will by voting the referendum get a decision that is representative of the organization, where here we cannot be so sure of doing it. It does not cost near as much to submit a referendum as it does to continue under a craft administration or a mistaken administration.

DEL. REID: May I ask how many locals it is stated there that could ask for a referendum?

DEL. KINNEALLY: Five all told. (The resolution in question was again read by Del. Kinneally.)

DEL. AUGUSTINE: A point of information. I would like to know from the maker of that resolution whether these locals would be from one locality or not.

DEL. DUNCAN: It was my intention that they should come from any part of the Industrial Workers of the World. But naturally a local in a particular locality would get the seconds of other locals from different localities if the question was of importance to a whole department or to the whole general organization. If it was a question of local importance the referendum would be taken in that industrial body which was concerned. If it was only a department that was concerned the referendum could be taken in the department. But if it were the whole organization that were concerned it should be taken in the whole organization, even though it did happen to be initiated and seconded by locals in the same immediate vicinity.

DEL. AUGUSTINE: Another question. Wouldn't it be better that the seconds for the resolution or initiative for the referendum should come from different localities? Would it not be better to provide that in your resolution?

DEL. DUNCAN: Well, I do not think it would be necessary. I do not think it would be advisable. If it just happened that the locals interested did not exist in the same locality, I think as long as the brothers were there that they should receive just as much consideration as any part of the Industrial Workers of the World. I think they should receive just as much consideration whether they existed in this locality, in that locality or in separate localities.

DEL. AUGUSTINE: Comrade Chairman, I am opposed to the resolution in favor of the committee's report, for the following reasons: As the resolution now reads it would be the means of precipitating the general administration into great expense if a local could get seconds from the same locality in which it itself belonged, and this resolution does not provide against such a result. That is the reason I am opposed to the resolution and in favor of the committee's report.

DEL. RICHTER: A question of information, Mr. Chairman. Is there any provision at this time as far as the constitution has been adopted, in reference to the referendum if occasion arises for such?

THE CHAIRMAN: There is none that the Chair knows of.

DEL. RICHTER: Well, if there was any provision made in the constitution would that prevent a referendum being initiated in case occasion would make it necessary?

DEL. DE LEON: The constitution provides that.

DEL. RICHTER: What is the Chair's opinion on that?

THE CHAIRMAN: There is nothing to prevent the Executive Board from initiating a referendum if they so desired.

DEL. RICHTER: They could?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

DEL. TULLAR: Mr. Chairman, I believe in a genuine democracy, but my experience with referendum votes has been very unsatisfactory to me. We see a constituency of somewhere in the neighborhood of 60,000 members, and we initiate a referendum vote, and we find that of the 60,000 and some odd members but three or four thousand respond and vote upon the proposition. That is how it has proved in the past year. That is, I am not in favor of a referendum vote that does not express the will of the majority. I take up the "Miners' Magazine," containing the report of the last convention, and I see columns there where referendum votes had been submitted to the rank and file, and we hear that they have somewhere about 28,000 men, and we see that of the 28,000 men only 7,000 voted on the proposition, and I contend that that 7,000 is not an expression of the 28,000, and unless the rank and file wish to take up the question of referendum votes and vote as the law would give them the privilege of doing, we better have our business conducted as we are conducting it now, because we get a better expression of the rank and file than we would under such circumstances.

DEL. HOLMES: I wish to state that I am thoroughly in accord with that resolution. As to these remarks of Comrade Augustine and all those that were just discussing, I maintain that we could have had ten referendums and it would not be as expensive as that Executive Board that we just formed. I want also to say this, that any organization, that is a revolutionary organization, must be governed by the rank and file, and whether they vote on the referendum or not with their full strength cuts absolutely no ice in the matter. They have at least a chance to do it, and if they don't take advantage of it so much the worse for them, and it is absolutely no excuse to say that because they don't vote their full vote it is better to have no vote. I know we have got a good Executive Board now; I am aware of that fact. But that is not the point. No men are infallible, and any organization should have power at any time to institute any referendum that they see fit. The idea of expense does not enter into it. Every member of this organization, I believe, throughout the country, wishes to have it. That is what they are objecting to; with the previous affairs they had absolutely no say in anything that was done, and at least this body, this convention of revolutionists, should be willing and only too anxious to accord them that right.

DEL. DE LEON: As the mover of the motion I think it would be well to take up the arguments made against my motion to concur in the recommendation. Del. Duncan made three points. The first point I am utterly at a loss to understand. He said, "Why should we, because we are deprived of the referendum for a certain time, be wholly deprived of it for the rest of the time?" Upon what he bases that statement I do not know. We do not propose to deprive ourselves of the referendum for the rest of the year because we are to be deprived of it for some months; just the reverse. We propose to rest during

six or eight months just because we have been exercising it three months after the convention meets and are beginning to exercise it when the convention opens. The delegate refers to democracy. Aye, that is a great reference. Democracy? What does democracy mean? Does democracy mean a system of government that makes government impossible? Does democracy mean a system of individual freedom that throttles itself? Does democracy mean a system under which a small minority will have the power to hamper the work of the majority? If four locals have the right to initiate absolutely, notwithstanding the short period in between which the convention meets and the last referendum is held—if four locals have that right, then that infinite minority can overwhelm us with referendum, and when we meet in our locals to transact the business of this organization we shall have a referendum to deal with. Democracy means respect for the minority, but it does not mean the death of the majority. It means respect for the minority, that it shall not be trampled upon, but it does not pass the sword over into the hands of the minority to make it possible for them to do as they like. We have had a sample of that sort of democracy in this convention, where an infinite minority in number of delegates and a decided minority in number of votes has held us up. I believe if it had not been for the fact that the minority had the share they had that it would have taken some irruption to oust them, and the work of the organization would have proceeded infinitely quicker. But I am all the more astounded at the argument in favor of democracy when the delegate circumscribes it to four locals. If four, why not three locals? If three locals, why not two locals? If two locals, why not one local? And in the name of democracy, if one local, why not one individual? I consider that we have all the referendum and initiative that we can stand. The constitution provides on page 11 for the initiative and referendum for the departments and sub-departments on actions of the Executive Board. We have a referendum three months after this convention adjourns, and since it has sat over two weeks it will be about eight months when we meet again, and one month before that we have additional suggestions of referendum. But in closing, and to show the absurdity into which position works itself, I want to call your attention to the illustration given by Del. Duncan. He says, suppose an executive officer is guilty of treason and you want to depose him, should we not have the power to quickly cut off his head? If he had said, suppose we should depose an executive officer because we like, then I would have said all right. His illustration was, suppose an executive officer is guilty of treason, shall we not cut off his head? Are we going to cut off a man's head for treason without giving him a trial. I say there is the barbarism of Russia, and there is where extremes meet. Extreme democracy and extreme autocracy cannot be separated one from the other. If we have an officer who is guilty of treason we should proceed in such a way as wise experience may indicate. A referendum branding a man as a traitor does not give him an opportunity to be heard. A referendum must be carried out within a certain period. The call must be issued and the vote must close. How will that man be heard? How can that man be heard? What provisions are made for hearing that man? While we would like to hang the G. E. B., we have cut off their heads in regulation style, and we have avoided all such things as a trial except the expenses of the trial. No, that is not democracy. I have had too much experience with it to allow myself to be hoodwinked into a democracy whose practical working is autocracy, and I am sure that I voice the sentiment of the committee when I decline to be forced into the attitude of opposing

democracy by referendum, whereas what we are trying to do is the product of democracy and the referendum.

DEL. DUNCAN: Bro. Chairman—

DEL. DE LEON: I don't want to have the last word, but I think we are working under rules, and the rules provide that the mover of the question shall have an opportunity to speak at the close; that those who speak to the motion shall have five minutes each unless no one wants to speak. I asked if anybody wanted to speak. Nobody arose, and I stated that I closed the discussion. If we are to have it opened up again it may go on I don't know how long.

DEL. DUNCAN: I rise to a point of order. It was for the Chair to ask who wants to speak, and not for an individual delegate.

DEL. DE LEON: I rise to a point of order. I insist on it.

Del. Moore arose.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you desire to speak on the motion, Del. Moore?

DEL. MOORE: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair will have to rule you out of order at this time. If you desire to ask a question, that will be different.

DEL. MOORE: I thought that was the trick of the talker.

DEL. DUNCAN: I move a substitute, if the motion is in order.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair will rule the substitute out of order.

DEL. McINTOSH: I desire to ask a question. Is there any provision made by the Constitution Committee for the instituting of a referendum, or is there any provision in the constitution calling for a referendum?

THE CHAIRMAN: Departments can demand a referendum on anything, I believe. The section is in there, but I have not got it here.

DEL. KLEESE: Page 11.

DEL. McINTOSH: Then I must certainly vote against the report of this committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection to granting unanimous consent to the concurrence in the report of this committee?

DEL. DUNCAN: I object.

DEL. McINTOSH: I want to be recorded as voting in the negative.

DEL. HOLMES: I want to be recorded as voting in the negative.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Secretary will call the roll.

DEL. FORBERG: Before the roll is called couldn't we have the recommendation of the committee read over again? I got in late and did not hear it.

DEL. DE LEON: It was not to concur.

Del. Kinneally read the resolution.

DEL. KINNEALLY: The committee reports adversely on the document, or not to concur.

DEL. KLEESE: I would like to have that part of the constitution read, Bro. Kinneally.

DEL. HOLMES: I wish to be recorded voting against the committee's proposal.

DEL. KINNEALLY: I will read the whole paragraph. (Reading from constitution, page 11, 3rd paragraph:) "The General Executive Board shall have full power to conduct the affairs of the organization between conventions, and their decision on all matters pertaining to the organization, or any subordinate part thereof, shall be binding, subject to an appeal to the next convention, or to the entire membership of the organization; provided that in case a referendum vote of the membership is demanded by any subordinate, or sub-department, part

of the organization, the expense of submitting the matter to referendum shall be borne by the organization taking the appeal, except wherein the decision of the General Executive Board shall be reversed by a vote of the membership, then the expense shall be borne by the general organization."

(Question called for.)

THE CHAIRMAN: The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called and resulted: Total vote, 421; yes, 377; no, 44.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is carried. The Secretary will proceed to read.

#### COMPLETE AUTONOMY.

DEL. KINNEALLY (continuing report of Constitution Committee): Resolution presented by the same delegate from the same local (Del. Duncan, Local 222):

"Whereas, complete autonomous action on the part of any section of a labor organization is always prejudicial to the general welfare of such organization; be it

"Resolved, That the expression 'complete industrial autonomy' or 'complete autonomy' or 'complete department autonomy' shall not be used in the constitution of the I. W. W."

Not concurred in by the committee, being already covered by previous decisions of the body.

DEL. DUNCAN: I move you that that resolution be concurred in. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded that the report of the committee be not concurred in and that the resolution be concurred in. You have heard the motion; are you ready for the question? (Question called for.)

DEL. SHENKAN: I would like to ask what action the convention has taken wherein the resolution is not concurred in?

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you desire an answer from the Chair?

DEL. SHENKAN: I would like to get it either from the Chair or anybody.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair will answer you by saying that there is no provision in the constitution granting complete autonomy to any part of the Industrial Workers of the World except in their internal affairs, and that this organization has not got the right to meddle in the internal affairs of any department or local. Therefore, this is unnecessary.

DEL. SHENKAN: Then this resolution is superfluous; is that the idea?

A DELEGATE: Yes.

DEL. DUNCAN: May I say a word in explanation? The mere fact that this committee does not concur in this resolution shows that there is some purpose in their not concurring. Otherwise they would concur. Now, the expression, "complete industrial autonomy," does occur right here in their proposed Article I, Section 2, Paragraph A, and it is qualified immediately after with the expression, "in their internal affairs." Now, I hold that that expression is contradictory and any autonomy cannot be complete unless it is in all their affairs. Now, for us to put a contradictory expression like that in our constitution is going to be misleading to the working class when they read it. They are going to take it that we do have complete industrial autonomy in the Industrial Workers of the World. That is not true. I hope that it won't be true and that we will just say "autonomy" if we are going to make any reference to the subject at all, or "industrial autonomy." But it cannot be complete if it is restricted; if it is restricted it can-

not be complete. Therefore, I think we ought to cut out that expression or the use of any similar expression anywhere.

DEL. MOSKOWITZ: Bro. Duncan is getting away from the point. Here it says plainly, "subdivision industrial and national industrial unions shall have complete industrial autonomy in their respective internal affairs, provided"— We have been discussing this question here almost two hours. "Providing"— that leaves out the whole question, and I think the committee in its report states truly that we have passed on this question, and that this debate has been a waste of time.

DEL. DUNCAN: As the maker of the motion, I just want to say another word. The proviso does not make any difference. That "provided" clause only restricts it further. If it is restricted at all it cannot be complete. What is the use of using a contradictory expression in our constitution? It will only mislead those that read it.

DEL. MOORE: I am in favor of this resolution, and I deny that we had any such argument as has been brought forth. I deny that this Article I and all this subsequent clause was ever adopted in that way at all. The proposition came up after the committee brought in its report, and it read the first article, and the argument came up that we take them up seriatim, and in that vote to take them up seriatim they tricked this convention into voting for this article and to take up Article II. I was tricked into it, and we didn't know that taking it up seriatim included that article, and the facts and figures will show it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Call the roll.

DEL. DE LEON: What are we voting on?

THE CHAIRMAN: We are voting not to concur in the report of the committee and voting to accept the resolution as presented.

The roll call was begun.

DEL. MOSKOWITZ: I want to know what he vote means. If I vote in favor of the report, do I vote yes?

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is not to concur in the report of the committee.

DEL. HOLMES: Then I change my vote. I thought it was to concur.

DEL. MOSKOWITZ: I vote no.

SEC. EDWARDS: Holmes, No.

The roll call was resumed.

DEL. KLEESE: I want to concur in the report of the committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: How do you vote?

DEL. KLEESE: I suppose that would be no.

The roll call was finished and resulted: Total vote, 435; yes, 8; no, 427.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion to adopt the resolution is lost. Now, the report of the committee is before the convention yet. Are there any objections to concurring?

DEL. FOOTE: I move unanimous consent.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any objections to granting unanimous consent to concurring in the report of the committee?

The following delegates asked to be recorded in the negative: Duncan, Moore, Flasekamp and McKnight.

THE CHAIRMAN: Then the report of the committee is carried.

#### MEMBERSHIP IN FRATERNAL SOCIETIES.

DEL. KINNEALLY (Constitution report continued): Presentation by W. L. Hall, delegate: "No member shall be eligible to become a member of the General Executive Board or General Secretary-Treasurer

or Assistant General Secretary-Treasurer of the I. W. W. who is a member of any fraternal society or other labor organization." The committee recommends that it be not concurred in.

DEL. TULLAR: I move the adoption of the committee's report. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been regularly moved and seconded that the report of the committee be adopted. You have heard the motion.

DEL. DUNCAN: I move as a substitute motion that the resolution of Bro. Hall be concurred in. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded as a matter before the house or motion before the house that the resolution of Bro. Hall be concurred in. You have heard the motion; are you ready for the question? (Question called for.)

DEL. DE LEON: I wish to make an explanation to show why the committee recommended not to concur. We found it impossible to define a fraternal organization. We found that there are sick and death societies, mutual societies for the protection of life, limb and other things, and we found it was impossible to determine and define a fraternal organization. With the spirit as we understand it of the resolution we were in sympathy, but when we came to legislate and put it in legislative form we found serious obstacles, too serious to be overcome.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Secretary will call the roll.

DEL. HESLEWOOD: At the present time we can get along without this farce of a roll call. We have elected an Executive Board, and every one of them, I believe, belongs to a fraternal society, and this appears to me a useless waste of time and work to have a roll call. I belong to a fraternal society, and so do you. We belong to the Western Federation of Miners, one of the finest kinds of an organization, perhaps, in the world. There is no use going into a thing of this kind. We have got to get our work done on the Executive Board and get home. I have to get home myself. At the present time it would be a useless thing.

DEL. DUNCAN: I thought Bro. Hall's resolution was a good one when I heard it read, as it evidently contemplated such fraternal societies as the Masons, Odd Fellows and other societies in which capitalism is pretty well mixed up. But I realize Bro. De Leon's difficulty. It is pretty hard to define what a fraternal society is, and, realizing the situation as he states it, if my second is willing, I will withdraw the substitute.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection to the withdrawal of the substitute?

DEL. MOORE: I object.

THE CHAIRMAN: Now, it would strike the Chair that if we wanted to do business here the delegates should not insist upon their personal rights to the detriment of the rights of this convention.

DEL. MARKLEY: Hear, hear.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is what we kicked against in opposing here the obstructionist tactics that were obstructing the work of this convention. That is what Bro. Moore got up and left the convention for once. Now I find him in the same place, and I would appeal to him, if he desires to be recorded in favor of it, to be recorded, but don't obstruct the work of the convention to the extent of having a vote taken on his personal views when it is apparent that he is in a hopeless minority.

DEL. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, I simply refuse to withdraw because I believe we should take some action right here, and now, on Comrade

Hall's motion. I heartily agree with him in his meaning. I think the meaning is well understood.

(Question called for.)

THE CHAIRMAN: The Secretary will call the roll.

DEL. SCHWEINBURG: Make it unanimous.

DEL. DE LEON: Can't it be made unanimous with one dissenting vote?

DEL. HOLMES: I vote no.

DEL. FLASCHKAMP: And I.

DEL. MOSKOWITZ: There is no one objecting, but Bro. Moore, and I think we can simply record him voting in the negative.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection to granting unanimous consent to the withdrawal of this substitute? Del. Moore and Del. Flaschkamp desire to be recorded as objecting. Is there any objection to granting unanimous consent to the adoption of the report of the committee on this matter? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

#### BASIS OF REPRESENTATION.

DEL. KINNEALLY (continuing report): From Local 7, Metal and Machinery Department: "The local union shall be the basis of representation for delegates to the convention, doing away with the industrial department delegates." The committee recommends not to concur.

DEL. KLEESE: I move to concur in the report of the committee. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded that the report of the committee be concurred in.

DEL. SCHWEINBURG: I would like to ask the secretary of the Constitution Committee if they have made any provision for delegates to the convention. I have not heard any yet. If the secretary of the Constitution Committee could give us his report so that we would know what they have got, then we would know how to vote.

DEL. KINNEALLY: The constitution as it remains covers that. The constitution is to remain as it is as far as we are concerned.

DEL. SCHWEINBURG: It remains as it is? Now, Mr. Chairman, I don't believe the Constitution Committee has got the right to stand on the old constitution as far as the delegates to the convention are concerned. At the first convention that we have after the formation of the Industrial Workers of the World we heard a kick coming from all over the house that 4,000 members in one department should not be represented by one delegate, and I hold that if a department is tomorrow organized with 10,000 men, three men have no right to be delegates for those 10,000 in that same place. We must have here a ways and means to give the constituents or the rank and file a better representation in the convention than we did with the old constitution.

DEL. MOSKOWITZ: A point of information—

THE CHAIRMAN: Del. Schweinburg has the floor.

DEL. SCHWEINBURG: I am talking on the motion. I am not in favor of requiring that every local union shall be represented by delegates, but there must be some means found where different local unions can combine and send a certain number of delegates to represent them at the convention. But I am not in favor of the recommendation of the Constitution Committee to stand on the old constitution of 4,000 members.

DEL. MOSKOWITZ: I wish to inform this convention that the Organization Committee has acted on this proposition if I am not mistaken.



DEL. RICHTER: Yes.

DEL. MOSKOWITZ: And the Organization Committee has made provision that no delegate shall hold more than 10 votes.

DEL. RICHTER: One thousand members; that is correct.

DEL. TULLAR: I want to go on record here as being opposed to that section of the constitution which calls for departmental delegates. I want to go on record as being in favor that every local union of each and every department shall be entitled to representation in the annual convention of the Industrial Workers of the World.

DEL. PARKS: Mr. Chairman, the brother has referred to a vital part of our organization, but our report has not been acted upon, so that it is not proper to bring that up here. I will state my idea. My idea is that within the department, if any local union feels that the departmental delegates who have been elected will not for any reason reflect their ideas in this convention, the local unions within that department shall have the right at their own expense to credential men to come here and represent that local union, and the amount of votes that the departmental delegates receive shall be subtracted to correspond accordingly. That principle was operated upon here in the last convention. The Butte Milling and Smeltermen's Union No. 74 of the Western Federation of Miners sent M. P. Haggerty down here with authority to cast 1,000 votes for them. That union was not sure that the delegates that came here representing the Western Federation of Miners would exactly represent them. They know Haggerty, and so they elected and sent him. One of the first things that occurred in this convention was the seating of Mr. Haggerty here with 1,000 votes. They instructed him that if the delegates of the Western Federation of Miners did not install the Western Federation he should install the Butte Milling and Smeltermen's Union No. 74 anyhow. That was the special instruction that Haggerty came here under last year. But how are we to do this? Is it the function of this convention to do it? I believe that if we would not try to accomplish that purpose which I believe the rank and file and all the revolutionary element in this convention are in accord with, it would be adding more and more to the herculean task that we have before us at the present time. I believe we should make a recommendation to the different departments that they make provision along the lines of my remarks. See what we will come up against: Suppose the Department of Mining is allowed to be represented here by four or five delegates, what would the mine owners and operators have to do in order to control the I. W. W.? Simply use a little money in the Denver convention of the Western Federation of Miners and have their representatives here on the floor of the I. W. W. Now, if it should develop that the locals within that organization feel that the men that are selected will not for some reason or other represent them, it seems to me that there ought to be some provision made for that. But I believe I express the opinion of the Committee on Constitution when I say that it is the consensus of this convention when I say that we should allow the arrangement to be made by the department itself, and I believe that when the rank and file so understand it they will make such arrangement probably, and for that reason I am going to vote at this time to concur in the report of the Committee on Constitution. I am in favor of it.

DEL. RICHTER: I would like to be cleared upon this point. I was under the impression that by a vote taken yesterday upon this subject we put a limit on the membership to be represented by one delegate. Is that a fact or not?

THE CHAIRMAN: You are very much mistaken there.

DEL. RICHTER: Would a motion to that effect be in order at this time?

THE CHAIRMAN: An amendment to the motion to that effect would be in order.

DEL. RICHTER: Well, I will make a motion for 1,000.

THE CHAIRMAN: If you will just let the Chair have the floor before you make it I believe you won't make it.

DEL. RICHTER: I don't understand.

THE CHAIRMAN: I say, if you will just allow the Chair to take the floor a few minutes on this proposition before you make the motion I don't believe you will care to make it.

DEL. RICHTER: All right.

(Del. Lingenfelter took the chair.)

DEL. ST. JOHN: We know that the aim of this organization is to have the voice of the membership control its actions in these conventions and in every other particular. But that voice and that control must be exercised along lines that make it possible to come to a decision. If you have a convention to which every local of this organization is entitled to send a delegate to represent that local and if this movement grows as we hope it will grow, the next convention of this organization will simply be a mob. Instead of having one or two hundred delegates we will have that many thousand, one or two thousand delegates, and if you are going to have departmental representation at all it would be broken in upon by having local representation in that department also, because it would result in the same proposition. Neither can you limit the number of votes which one delegate is allowed to cast to any such number as 1,000, because that means exactly the same thing, that if the Industrial Workers of the World reach a membership of 200,000 or 300,000, then in order to be represented at the convention you will have to have two or three hundred votes here, and as the organization grows it enlarges your convention and it makes it impossible to transact any business whatever.

DEL. RICHTER: Comrade Chairman and fellow delegates, anybody who denies departmental representation in this organization, denies the form of organization that we adopted, denies even knowing anything about organization whatever. Our Industrial Workers of the World was intended to organize all workers. It intended to form locals. It proposes to combine the locals together in the same general industrial organization, and this general organization will be combined together with what is called departments, and the departments will form the industrial whole. Now, why are we doing these things? Simply to facilitate matters. Otherwise there would be absolutely no sense in doing these things. Now, take for example these possible 5,000 locals throughout the United States. These 5,000 locals would be represented by 5,000 men. Can you show me any hall where the 5,000 men can meet? Can these 5,000 men facilitate business in a good and honest way? Now, concentrating these locals together in what we call national industrial organizations or departments means the will of the majority always will be concentrated in a smaller unit. That smaller unit, which will be the smallest thing in the department, will be represented in the large national convention. This is following up the line of organization. We cannot help ourselves. If we do not want to do that we might as well deny these small organizations representation and deny the form of organization that we have adopted. We cannot get out of it.

DEL. DUNCAN: I would like to have the motion read before the house.

THE CHAIRMAN (pro tem): The Secretary will read the motion. The motion is to concur in the report of the committee.

DEL. DUNCAN: I want the report of the committee read.

THE CHAIRMAN (pro tem): You want the resolution read?

DEL. DUNCAN: Yes.

DEL. KINNEALLY: "The local union shall be the basis for representation of delegates to the convention, doing away with industrial department delegates." The committee reports adversely on the recommendation.

DEL. SHENKAN: I do not believe in having the constitution remain as it is at present. I believe we should construct and reconstruct our constitution according to the needs of our organization. We find by our experience right here in this convention that practically the whole vote of this organization depends upon four men. The four men if they voted unitedly could control the convention. If that vote is split then the other delegates have a chance to determine the actions of this convention. But the fact of the matter was that in some instances they were split and in some instances they were not split and they voted together, and, of course, we were practically disfranchised. Now, I do not think this is in harmony with the principles of the Industrial Workers of the World. I believe that there should be at least a more representative form of organization in the convention than what has prevailed at this convention. It least, one man should not have 109 votes, while a hundred men only one or two or three or more votes. I believe that the representative vote of individual delegates should at least be cut down from 109 to about 10 or 20 votes at the most. Therefore, I am in favor of the resolution.

(Del. St. John resumed the chair.)

DEL. DUNCAN: I move you as a substitute motion that we amend Article IV, Section 3 of our constitution so as to read: "Industrial departments shall have one delegate for every 1,000 members."

DEL. KLEESE: I second that amendment, if you are waiting for a second.

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded that the constitution be amended to read that department representation shall be based on one delegate for 1,000 members.

DEL. KINNEALLY: As a member of the committee I understand from a member of the Organization Committee that there is a recommendation coming from that committee in reference to this matter. As we are going into a long discussion of this matter and will have to go over the discussion again when the report of the organization committee comes in, I suggest that this matter be laid over till the report of the Organization Committee comes in on the same matter so that we can consider the whole subject and save time rather than waste time.

DEL. KLEESE: I think the matter is a very important one, but with due respect to the Organization Committee we should give them time to bring that before the convention, since we have consigned it to them to bring this matter up. It is one that will stand much debate. If we removed the office of President because we contended it was an opportunity for graft, for the same reason we should remove the powerful delegates because that is an opportunity for graft, and at some future convention of the Western Federation of Miners when the Standard Oil sees it to its benefit to throw out such men as St.

John and Ryan it will get some other men here. I withdraw my second.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection?

DEL. RICHTER: General consent to lay it over.

DEL. DUNCAN: I was of the opinion that we had better pass upon this now. As it comes up in the ordinary course of the Constitution Committee's report it certainly is a part of this subject matter and I do not know of any particular reason for hearing a different report on the same subject. All these reports delay the progress of the convention. We have got to consider them here, anyhow. I do not know why we should not consider that now. I don't want to withdraw it.

DEL. AUGUSTINE: A point of information. I would like to know why this matter that was referred to the Organization Committee was referred to it when it properly belonged to the Constitution Committee? I believe that the matter of representation certainly belongs to the Constitution Committee.

DEL. McINTOSH: What is this but the Constitution Committee?

DEL. AUGUSTINE: This resolution that was referred to the Organization Committee, that is the one I mean.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Secretary will call the roll on the substitute.

DEL. AUGUSTINE: Is the substitute before the house?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, the substitute is before the house.

DEL. McINTOSH: What are we voting on? To concur?

THE CHAIRMAN: The substitute is that no delegate shall cast any more than 10 votes and represent more than 1,000 members.

A DELEGATE: Ten votes?

THE CHAIRMAN: That is the effect.

DEL. DUNCAN: That would refer also to local unions. The substitute referred only to industrial departments, that industrial departments shall have one delegate for every 1,000 members.

DEL. SCHWEINBURG: Is the vote on the substitute?

THE CHAIRMAN: The secretary will call the roll on the substitute. It simply limits the voting strength of the departmental representation to representing 1,000 members.

The roll call was begun.

DEL. FOOTE: I wish to vote no on this proposition, and to state my reason for so doing, that we have got enough trouble on hand already. I vote no.

The roll call was continued.

DEL. PARKS: I want to state that this is altogether a different question than the one we had a while ago. It was not thrashed out. It does not do away with departmental delegates, but simply limits the number of votes that the departmental delegate shall have, and makes it necessary in the Mining Department to have 20 mining delegates instead of four. I am going to vote yes.

The roll call was then completed.

DEL. RYAN: Will you allow me to explain why I voted no, while there is nothing doing? (Referring to lull while vote was being counted.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, explain your vote.

DEL. RYAN: It is a rather delicate matter for me to vote on that because it is somewhat personal, I being one of the departmental delegates. Now, it costs the Western Federation of Miners about \$200 for each delegate that has been here at this convention, and we are representing two extremes; he comes from British Columbia and I come

from Arizona. The average expense of all the delegates will surely be about \$200 each. That will make about \$800. Now, on the basis of one delegate for each 1,000 members of the Western Federation of Miners, if they have the same membership at the next convention, they will send twenty-seven delegates. This, at \$200 each, will mean \$5,400. Now, taking the expense of the present representation, that would leave them a balance of \$4,600 that they could use for the purpose of organization and I contend that the stand taken by some of the delegates on this floor is a very peculiar one. They urge here as an argument for abolishing the office of President that the salary paid him would put two or three organizers in the field. Yet they propose to put on the Mining Industry an additional expense of three or four thousand dollars that would keep a good many more organizers in the field, whether class-conscious or not. Therefore, I vote against this.

DEL. KLEESE: May I explain my vote after the vote is announced?

The vote was announced as follows: Total vote, 310; yes, 79; no, 321.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is lost.

DEL. KLEESE: The reason why I voted as I did was because I realize that the Mining Department control this vote, and at this time it would remain with the Mining Department which way they wanted this matter to go. I voice my personal sentiments on the matter. Now, as regards the money, I don't think the Mining Department is very saving on their money—

THE CHAIRMAN: You got up here to explain your vote and not to talk about money at all. The report of the committee is before this convention now. The substitute has been lost. Are there any objections to granting unanimous consent to the adoption of the report of the committee.

DEL. FLASCHKAMP: I object.

DEL. SHENKAN: I object.

DEL. DUNCAN: Record me as not voting.

DEL. HOLMES: Record me as objecting.

DEL. KLEESE: Make me another one.

THE CHAIRMAN: Del. Kleese not voting.

DEL. KLEESE: No; as objecting.

DEL. MCKNIGHT: Not voting.

DEL. MOORE: Not voting.

DEL. TULLAR: Put me down as objecting to that.

DEL. McCUE: I object.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any more delegates objecting? If not, the Chair will declare the report of the committee concurred in.

DEL. SCHWEINBURG: A point of information. Would it be proper now to bring in a resolution on the representation in the convention?

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair would rule that that matter has been settled.

#### EXPENSE OF DELEGATES TO CONVENTION.

DEL. KINNEALLY (continuing report on constitution): Two propositions as to expense of delegates to the convention. One that hereafter the car fare of all delegates to the national convention of the Industrial Workers of the World shall be paid by the national organization. The other pertaining to the expense of delegates to national conventions, proposes that this be borne by the national organization by setting aside a part of the dues sufficient to cover the same. The committee reports adversely on both propositions.

DEL. DUNCAN: I did not hear the report, because there was so much noise.

Del. Kinneally repeated the statement before made.

DEL. RIORDAN: I move to concur in the report of the committee. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded that the report of the committee be concurred in. You have heard the motion; are you ready for the question? (Question called for.) Is there any objection to granting unanimous consent to concurrence in the report of the committee on this matter?

DEL. MOORE: I object.

THE CHAIRMAN: Del. Moore wishes to be recorded as objecting. Any further?

DEL. PETRIELLA: Not voting.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any further objections?

DEL. FLASCHKAMP: Not voting.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any further objections? If not, the Chair will declare the motion carried. So ordered.

#### DUTIES OF GENERAL SECRETARY-TREASURER.

DEL. KINNEALLY (continuing report): As to Section 4, Article II, duties of General Secretary-Treasurer, we recommend the rejection of a constitutional clause providing for his entire time to be devoted to clerical work, and the practice of going on agitation trips to be discontinued. The opinion of the Committee on Constitution is that it should be left to the judgment of the General Executive Board.

DEL. RIORDAN: I move to concur in the report of the committee.

Seconded and unanimously carried.

#### DUES AND INITIATION FEE.

DEL. KINNEALLY (continuing report): Presentation as to revenue. "Monthly dues to be governed by local conditions, and that all initiation fees be cut out." The committee non-concurs.

It was moved and seconded to adopt the committee's report.

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded that the committee's report be adopted. You have heard the motion; are you ready for the question?

DEL. SHENKAN: I would like to know if there is a provision contained in the constitution for local dues in such places where wages are so miserably low that they cannot afford fifty cents a month. For instance, in the textile industry where girls are working for three or four dollars a week and men with families are working for seven, eight and ten dollars a week. Fifty cents is a pretty large amount for those people, and I would like to know if any provision has been made for them.

DEL. REID: I might state that the organization—

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair will state that the constitution in regard to dues and per capita tax has not been touched. That has not been altered, and stands as it is at present.

DEL. KLEESE: Then it does not take action to cover this matter?

THE CHAIRMAN: No.

Motion unanimously carried.

#### LIMITING VOTES OF DELEGATES.

DEL. KINNEALLY (continuing report): A proposition as follows: "That no delegate shall be entitled to more than twelve votes"—that has been passed on—"more than twelve votes or to represent more than twelve locals in the convention." Non-concurred in by the committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have heard the report of the committee. What is your pleasure?

DEL. JOHNSON: I move to concur in the report. (Seconded.)

Motion carried by unanimous consent.

#### MAINTAINING HIGH WAGE SCALES.

DEL. KINNEALLY (continuing report): From Del. Duncan, Local 222:

"Whereas, the Industrial Workers of the World is the recognized enemy of the employing class, and to serve the purposes of the working class we must ever be active against our enemy; be it

"Resolved, That I. W. W. locals shall whenever possible maintain wage scales as high as consistent with local conditions."

DEL. KINNEALLY: It is the sense of the committee that all locals should get as high wages as possible (laughter), and that this proposition is unnecessary.

It was moved and seconded to concur. Unanimously carried.

DEL. DUNCAN: I want to say a word before you pass that. The committee's report did not pass upon the proposition of maintaining any wage scales. I think this is an important matter and we ought not to dismiss it lightly. There are a good many locals in the I. W. W. around the country that are not doing their duty at the present time in that respect. We ought not to lay ourselves open to criticism in the way of failing to conduct our part of the struggle as it is up to us. We ought not to permit an A. F. of L. local alongside of us in the same town to maintain a wage scale of two dollars and a half a day and get it, and the I. W. W. local in the same town get a lower wage at the same time and be railed at, as they are bound to be under such conditions. I think we should perform our part of the struggle as it is up to us day after day. This is a thing that we ought to take some action on. If we take action here it can be referred to by our organizers in the field in giving their instructions to local unions. This is a thing which, if permitted, will lay us open to serious criticism.

DEL. VEAL: I desire to ask Del. Duncan a question. Does that condition obtain in any place where the I. W. W. was organized.

DEL. DUNCAN: Yes, I will state that I have found it obtaining, but I have too much respect for the locals of the I. W. W. to mention their names here.

DEL. SHENKAN: I could mention places if you desired to do so. It is right here in Chicago.

THE CHAIRMAN: What is that?

DEL. SHENKAN: There is a local right here in Chicago that has adopted such methods, Mr. Chairman, and work below the scale adopted by another organization.

DEL. LUNDY: I am not in favor of standing for anything like that, for the simple reason that that is the aim of the American Federation of Labor, as I understand, to get wages higher or shorter working hours or something like that. They have no ultimate aim. If I am an I. W. W. man I want to get all I can get, and if I see a man over here getting three dollars a day I am going to get it too. I say it is wrong to have anything embodied in the constitution that they could possibly point to and say they get better hours. We want to get people in there for the sole purpose and ultimate aim of the emancipation of labor. If they can get better conditions let them get them, but discourage strikes. We want to avoid strikes, and we can get better wages, I think, without striking, and I am thoroughly opposed to having that embodied in the constitution.

**DEL. DUNCAN:** If a motion is in order, I want to move you that we concur in that resolution regarding wage scales.

**THE CHAIRMAN:** The report of the Committee on Constitution in this matter, Bro. Duncan, was that it be the sense of this convention that all locals of the I. W. W. get the highest wage scale possible. That has been adopted.

**DEL. DUNCAN:** I beg your pardon, Bro. Chairman, I did not hear the word "scale" mentioned in the committee's report. They merely said to get the highest wages they could. Any one would naturally infer from reading that that it was an individual proposition. Now, the proposition that we are up against is a proposition that relates to our organization, and as an organization we must take it up.

**THE CHAIRMAN:** The Secretary will proceed.

### BENEFIT INSURANCE.

**DEL. KINNEALLY** (report continued): Proposition signed by Wade R. Parks:

"Whereas, benefit insurance is admitted by many to be a necessary institution under capitalism; and

"Whereas, it is the opinion of many that it is necessary to have such an attachment to labor organizations; therefore, be it

"Resolved, That this convention appoint a standing committee to report to the next convention their findings and recommendations as to the best plan to be adopted to segregate the benefit insurance feature from direct connection with the I. W. W."

**DEL. KINNEALLY:** The committee do not concur.

It was moved to adopt the report of the committee. (No second.)

**DEL. PARKS:** Mr. Chairman, I am not going to make a motion to non-concur with the committee's recommendation, but I am going to state my reasons. Now, there are some fellows here say that we have provided in our constitution that there shall be no sick and death benefits whatsoever. We have not provided that. We have provided that none of the fifty-cents dues shall be appropriated for that, but we do not prohibit the organization thereby from going ahead and raising the dues to a dollar and using fifty cents for sick and death benefit purposes, and I have been in many unions where such obtains today. Now, this sick and death benefit feature is either a danger or it is not a danger. If it is a danger we ought to face it, and we ought to face it with a full understanding of what the dangers are. Now, I believe it is the general consensus of opinion that the sick and death benefit feature becomes a big thing in the eyes of many local organizations. I believe it is the consensus of opinion among the revolutionists that it has the ultimate result of leading away the union from its direct mission, just like capitalism. The International Cigar-makers' Union in the last year spent over \$290,000 for the funeral attachment and about \$9,000 in fighting the class struggle. That shows you what the result is of allowing this institution to be conducted in connection with the economic organization. Now, my resolution was not that we as an organization should devise a sick and death benefit, but it was that it would be a good plan for us to appoint a standing committee to investigate the subject pro and con and report to this convention next year their findings as to whether that is a real danger or whether it is not a real danger, and also their recommendations, providing for something that would look to the absolute and complete segregation of the sick and death benefit insurance feature from the labor organization. Now, that is the purpose of my resolution. It does not put us on record at all as being in favor of it, but it is putting



us in a position where we might in the future be prepared for an absolute program which will take us from the shambles of capitalism. It is remarkable to me that the committee fails to distinguish my motive. I have heard many people say that when that was read here it puts me in a bad light as advocating that feature in connection with our organization. I tell you we never know a thing unless we know the reason of the thing. I want to tell you that I have been told that Butte, Montana, Union No. 1 would probably have sustained the bolters from the Denver convention when they came back if those bolters could have maintained this one argument; that is, that they could have a sick and death benefit. Some of the revolutionists who were not admitted to the hall of the Butte, Montana, Union, yet who had cards of the Western Federation of Miners in their pockets, stayed outside of the hall at the head of the stairs and posted about 20 fellows as they went into the union that night to decide whether they were going to elect nine more members to go back to the Denver convention to take the places of the bolters. The constitution of the Industrial Workers of the World don't prohibit it from having a sick and death benefit. The argument of the bolters was that it was going to do away with the sick and death benefit features. And when some of the bolters got up in that union that night they said that with the constitution of the Industrial Workers of the World you cannot have a sick and death benefit or insurance or anything of that kind. About that time about twenty fellows jumped up from all over the hall and said, "You lie, you lie," and the next work that was done they repudiated those bolters from the Denver convention and they sent nine more back, or seven more, whatever it was, to take their places. This is a problem, and you cannot solve a problem by running away from it. The purpose of my resolution is to have a standing committee appointed to thrash this problem out so as to present all phases to the next convention and then to the rank and file so that some way may be devised as I said and the resolution states, so as to completely segregate this insurance and benefit feature from the revolutionary organization. That is all I have to say.

DEL. AUGUSTINE: Mr. Chairman—

THE CHAIRMAN: It strikes the Chair that there is no motion before the house.

DEL. AUGUSTINE: Then I move you to concur with the recommendation of the Committee on Constitution, and I wish to speak on it. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded that the recommendation of the Committee on Constitution in this matter be concurred in. Del. Augustine has the floor.

DEL. AUGUSTINE: Now, it is true what Comrade Parks says about there being no clause in the constitution regarding sick and death benefit separate from the organization except that it says here "All international industrial departments subordinate to the Industrial Workers of the World shall collect from the membership of their organizations a per capita tax at the rate of 25 cents per month per member, provided that no part of the above mentioned moneys shall be used for sick and accident or death fund, but shall be held in the treasury of the international industrial department for the purpose of paying the legitimate expense of maintaining the department." Now, this does not provide that no local union can have such an attachment, and if Comrade Parks had brought in a resolution to the effect that all sick and death benefit attachments should be separated from the Industrial Workers of the World I would have favored the resolution. But inas-

much as he leaves this in the hands of a committee to find out whether or not this will be a benefit to the organization and its members, I cannot vote for such a proposition. In the minds of all progressive working members it must be set clear and they must know that all such attachments are detrimental to the interests of any labor organization. If you should go over the field that the American Federation of Labor has gone and the organizations that still remain in the A. F. of L. you will find in a majority of cases that we have had sick and death benefit attachments. These sick and death benefit attachments have been one of the means to destroy one of the strongest organizations in New York, the Interborough Workers' Union. It is the means of keeping the cigarmakers from entering the Industrial Workers of the World, for the reason that they do not wish to leave that. They are tied to it so completely, they have paid so much money into it that they don't want—

**THE CHAIRMAN:** It strikes me that you are getting away from the motion. We are not discussing the advisability of having sick or death benefits at all; we are discussing the appointment of a committee to investigate and lay its findings on that matter before the next convention.

**DEL. AUGUSTINE:** Yes, but my motion provides that we do not do this. I am talking to my motion. I want to show the delegates that it is impossible to gain anything by that investigation. I do not think that investigation is necessary. The delegates on this floor, I think, are clear enough on that proposition and will be in the next convention more clear. That is all I want to say.

**DEL. MOORE:** I want to speak against the motion to concur, because it has been said here that we are a democratic body and it has also been said that we are a fraternal body, and all fraternal organizations include insurance. Now the proposition has come here from Comrade Parks that a committee be appointed to investigate and look into these things. It does not say whether we will have an attachment or a fund or won't have it. It is simply to have a committee to bring in its findings at the next convention. Now I want to say in opposition to the talk of Comrade Augustine here when he refers to the International Cigarmakers. Of course, the International Cigarmakers' proposition is rotten. There are also others come and talk about the typographical union, to which I have never belonged, but I am associated with its members. They have a means that would not destroy this organization. In fact, they have a means that would build this organization up. Their problem is simple. They have no trouble, they have no dues or anything. It is simply that when a member of a local dies every member of that local pays in a dollar. In a city like this when a man dies every member of the local in this city pays a dollar. That would be \$1,500. There isn't anything at all to it to hold you up. I am against the motion to concur, because I believe it should be investigated and that you should listen to the committee's report in the next convention.

**DEL. SCHWEINBURG:** Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of concurring in the report of the Constitution Committee for the reason that we of the old so-called Metal and Machinery Department tried that scheme last year. We sent out a fraternal vote to all the local unions throughout the country, asking if they wanted to have a death benefit for the Metal and Machinery Department, and the result of it was that 94 per cent voted against it and only a few local unions, about 6 per cent, voted in favor of it. That was the result. The general membership in the I. W. W. don't want to have any sick and death benefits; sick

benefit, only for this reason, because we can't control our men when they are sick, and we have got enough societies directly built up of working men here in this country, especially one, and if every industrial worker should like to be insured in a sick and death benefit he has got the best chance in a real working class organization, that is the Workingmen's Sick and Death Benefit Fund of the United States of America. There you get for one dollar more than we could give you for four dollars. The membership in the I. W. W. joined the organization, not to get any benefits out of it in case of sickness or death, but we joined the organization only for the purpose of emancipating us from the slavery of capitalism and for no other purpose. I would be against having the convention here institute any laws that any sick or death benefit shall be attached to the general organization. If the local unions throughout the country care to keep such a thing up, that is their own privilege. We have nothing against it. But we will not establish anything of that kind at this convention or at any future convention.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any objections to granting unanimous consent to concurrence in the report of the Committee on Constitution in this matter?

DEL. PARKS: I object.

THE CHAIRMAN: Del. Parks desires to object.

DEL. MOORE: I object.

THE CHAIRMAN: And Del. Moore.

DEL. SIMS: Mr. Chairman, what is the resolution to be concurred in?

THE CHAIRMAN: The resolution introduced by Del. Parks calling for the appointment of a committee of three to investigate and report its findings to the next convention as to the line of division between sick and death benefit societies and this organization.

DEL. SIMS: What is the report of the committee?

THE CHAIRMAN: That it be not concurred in.

DEL. McKNIGHT: Record me in the negative.

THE CHAIRMAN: Del. McKnight in the negative. Are there any further objections? If not, the Chair will declare the motion carried. So ordered.

#### SANCTIONED STRIKE BENEFITS.

DEL. KINNEALLY (continuing report): From the delegates from Local 176: "Resolved, that when a strike is duly sanctioned by the Executive Board, the Secretary-Treasurer shall have the power to forward strike benefits without waiting for the consent of the other members of the Executive Board." We report adversely upon the proposition.

On motion, report unanimously concurred in.

#### GENERAL DUES.

DEL. KINNEALLY: (report continued): Proposition from Del. Holmes: "Moved, that in Section 2, Article III, the words 'and mixed locals' be inserted after 'industrial departments,' to read as follows: 'Industrial departments and mixed locals shall pay as general dues into the treasury of the I. W. W. at the rate of 8-13 cents per month per member.'" We report adversely and recommend non-concurrence in the proposition.

DEL. PARKS: I move to concur in the committee's report. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded that the report of the committee in this matter be concurred in.

**DEL. HOLMES:** I want to say a few words on this. I won't take up very much time. In introducing that in regard to mixed locals I should have properly said 'recruiting locals.' I think that would have been better. I want to say that I am actuated by no desire to get anything for the recruiting local. I belong to one myself, but I am simply introducing this as a means of doing more propaganda and extending the scope of the Industrial Workers of the World. Now, every man knows that anybody who joins a recruiting local joins it not with the object of getting any immediate advantage. He knows that it cannot possibly be any. It is a mixture of men of different trades or men of no trade at all. He cannot ask the organization for any strike benefits because he cannot go on strike. That organization can be absolutely no expense to the Industrial Workers of the World. When we go out and talk and ask them to join it, the men who are not class conscious will say to us, "What will we get?" We cannot promise that they can get anything if they strike. We simply point out to them that they are joining a class-conscious organization that is looking for the emancipation of the working class. Now, the men who join us, if they are not class conscious, are at least class instinctive, and with the education that they get in that recruiting local they become in time class conscious. A recruiting local goes out and distributes literature, holds meetings, and it saves this organization the expense of organizing. When it gets a sufficient number of men belonging to any particular trade it organizes a local of that particular trade. It goes out and fights the A. F. of L. I have seen local unions of trades doing absolutely nothing in a town, and I have seen the recruiting local carry the whole burden on their back. So, as I said before, this is not for the purpose of getting anything for the recruiting local. It is simply to enable them to have better means to carry on the propaganda for the Industrial Workers of the World; holding meetings, distributing literature, challenging the A. F. of L. and doing everything in their power to advance the organization; and I think if we grant this we are granting nothing but what will be for the benefit of the I. W. W.

**DEL. SIMS:** It is true the mixed local in Milwaukee of which I am a member has instructed me to stand absolutely by that proposition or to use my influence as best I can to get a reduction in regard to the per capita tax that they should pay directly to the general headquarters. There is perhaps nothing I can say in addition to what Comrade Holmes has said, because every word that he said practically I would say. The mixed local is practically a recruiting station for the I. W. W., and in that recruiting station we find any number of girls, boys and men who don't get large wages, and who are not able to pay the amount that a skilled mechanic could pay. Hence I think it would be no more than right that they should be granted the same privilege that is accorded to a department. Now, the burden and expense that they have got to go to comes absolutely out of each and every individual pocket. That is an organization which you might practically say is a voluntary proposition. Each and every member that comes in there comes in voluntarily. There is no direct material incentive to inspire him to come there, any further than his class instinct, and I think it is no more than right that this convention here should grant that class of dispensation to the mixed locals which are building up recruits for this organization.

**DEL. SHENKAN:** I concur in the remarks made by the two previous speakers, and can only add to what they have said by quoting some work which has been done by the San Francisco local of which I was a member at the time I was in San Francisco. That local held

meetings every Sunday night. There was a standing rule there to hold regular meetings every Sunday night for propaganda purposes where the working class of the city of San Francisco was invited to join. As a consequence not alone by the distribution of literature but also by these mass meetings in the halls and the street meetings at which quite a number of leaflets and quite a lot of other literature was distributed freely, we were enabled to change the sentiments of the workers, even those of the A. F. of L., in our favor. It was seen in the demonstration in favor of Moyer and Haywood when 7,000 people attended the mass meeting and about 1,500 people joined in the parade. We also engaged halls where various employees of the different factories were invited to attend for the purpose of instructing them in the principles of the Industrial Workers of the World, with the intent and purpose of organizing them into their respective industrial local unions; and for that reason I believe that the general office through this convention should be enabled to give them all encouragement possible to carry on organizing work for the Industrial Workers of the World.

DEL. TULLAR: Just one word. These local unions that are so-called mixed locals and unattached to a department, now pay 25 cents per capita tax to the general organization. If that per capita tax is allowed to be reduced to 8 1-3 cents the same as the departmental per capita tax, then the money intended for strike fund use will deplete the treasury. If these same locals carry on propaganda work as they ought and the dues are to be 8 1-3 cents and there is a strike and a call upon the general treasury for strike dues, you are going to have the general treasury depleted and no strike fund to draw upon.

DEL. LINGENFELTER: I am going to put my mixed local on trial. I believe a majority of the local are coal miners. These coal miners work in what is called Umslach mines. An Umslach mine is a co-operative concern. When the coal diggers went out in the United Mine Workers of America we promptly notified our members that they ought to get what the United Mine Workers were striking for, and if the Umslach mine had refused them the majority of our mixed local would have gone out on strike. Does Bro. Holmes and our brother over here and the balance of them assume for a moment that we could not depend upon the support of our general organization? And if we pay 8 1-3 cents what right have we got then to ask for the full amount of support from the general organization? Now, it is true, as I said, that the majority are miners. If we had men to work and organize a miners' local, as I understand from the report of the Western Federation, they would have denied them, under the circumstances, a charter. Hence there was only one way out of it, to take them into the mixed local, and we took them in, and if they had been forced out on strike we would have demanded benefits. Therefore I hold that we are compelled to charge 50 cents. Again, let us take it the other way. I am now barred out of the International Cigar-makers' Union. But say for the sake of argument that I go into a non-union factory and there is a spontaneous strike there for a dollar more on a thousand and I pull out of there. I hold that since I paid the 50 cents a month the general organization must protect me or else I must scab on the non-union men in a spontaneous strike, which is more than scabbing on a scab institution like the International Union. There are two sides to this question. Now, in view of those facts and in view of the fact that those making the fight must be supported financially, I shall have to vote against the views of our friends.

DEL. FITZGERALD: Fellow delegates, I was instructed from Local

Union 185, Mixed Local, San Antonio, to see if we could not reduce the per capita tax to mixed locals. Now, there is no man in this convention but what can say and must agree with me that the mixed local is for educational purposes only. There is nothing in what this Comrade Lingenfelter has said here about the coal miners. The constitution as it reads now says that if there are enough coal miners in that local it has then got to be a local of the general organization or the Mining Department. Now, then, the educational local is this mixed local, and whenever there are enough in this mixed local to start a local union of any department or any trade in that organization then they must go out. Now, then, it is true what Bro. Holmes has said here, it is true what Bro. Parks has said, and other men, that these men have expended all their time. I know at San Antonio, Texas, when I arrived there last winter the Transportation Department was in a state of chaos. I will refer to Trautmann here and my report showed that the minds of those men were clarified so that they stood by this fight for education that was put forth by this mixed local of San Antonio, Texas. They didn't exceed possibly twenty or twenty-five men. They come as revolutionists from all the different departments and they center themselves here. As soon as we find that they have enough to form a local they do, and possibly five or six are left. They have to pay the same for literature, and the same for everything else as every other local, and I think if we would not reduce the per capita tax, that if the mixed local is in good standing it at least should be permitted to have all the literature that is necessary to carry on the propaganda work in that district without any charge from the general organization.

DEL. GOSS: I come from a local that has instructed me to work for a reduction of the per capita tax. If we are to legislate ourselves out of wage slavery we have got to take in the lowest paid class of people. And before you can do that you have got to get the per capita tax down so you can have a dues so the lowest paid working man can come in. Bro. Tullar says that you haven't got the money. Where you get one dollar now you will get four dollars by reducing the per capita tax and cutting it in two.

DEL. RICHTER: Now, it is evident that the majority of the delegates are instructed or recognize that the reduction of dues in this organization is necessary. From the report of our General Secretary it is evident that there are over 40,000 dues-paying members at this time outside of the Mining Department. If the dues are reduced to 15 cents per member, which I think would be a rate that would be possible for any member of the working class to pay—15 cents per month—it would mean an increase over the present membership or it would mean an income of \$72,000 a year or \$6,000 a month. If the running of the office of the Industrial Workers of the World requires \$1,000 a month and the organizers \$1,000 or \$2,000 a month it will still leave \$3,000 every month for strike benefit or such an expenditure as may come up. Now, we can expect that the membership will increase. So, from a calculation of figures and the material at hand it is evident that 15 cents would provide sufficient funds to carry on the work of this organization successfully, and it would create a fund that would increase with the increase in membership. And therefore I move as an amendment that the dues of local unions to the general organization shall be 15 cents; those of individual members 25 cents; and that the initiation fee shall not be more than \$2.00.

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded as an amend-

ment to the motion that the per capita tax of local unions be 15 cents per month, and of individuals 25 cents. You have heard the motion.

DEL. HOLMES: Does this apply to a local union that can go on strike and get some advantage now, as well as others?

THE CHAIRMAN: It applies to all of them, in the opinion of the Chair.

DEL. MOORE: I rise to talk against the amendment. The proposition when it was brought here was not to concur in the committee's report. It was simply that the mixed locals should have the benefit. Now you want to bring up an amendment to give something more, if you please, for Comrade Tullar and Comrade Lingenfelter to take and give those locals, that are getting some benefit from the strike, the same chance as the mixed local. The mixed locals are the only thing we are considering and the only thing we should consider. The mixed local, as has been said, is a recruiting station. It is an index as you may well call it. You are getting a dollar a year from the man that comes in from a district local. They are getting a dollar a year from him to let him have the privilege of taking his mixed local out on the street and agitating. That is what he is giving for the national headquarters, and he needs all of that other 37 cents or 42 cents that he has got in that local. For illustration, Del. Kinneally said some local is away down to 16 men. I promise you that the mixed local needs all of that 50 cents. The idea that the mixed locals would pay three times as much money into this organization and get absolutely no benefit, three times as much as a department, is absolutely unjust. I am for not concurring in the report. I am for 8-13 cents per member for the mixed local.

DEL. FORBERG: Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment to the motion, and opposed to the motion also. I am absolutely in favor of leaving the per capita tax of the organization just as it is now. As to the mixed locals needing all the money they get for propaganda purposes, I would like to say that I am myself a member of a mixed local. As to whether the mixed local can get any benefits from the organization or not, I supposed that every delegate in this room understood that what this organization was for was for freeing the wage slaves from wage slavery. If that is true the members of the mixed local are given just as much as the members of the regular organization. Now, as to their being a recruiting union for the purpose of education, if the members of a mixed local cannot pay \$3 a year to propagate the ideas of industrial unionism I do not think they are worthy of the name of being called a recruiting station for this organization. Neither do I believe that anyone who cannot afford to pay \$3 a year to build up this organization, which is the precursor of the co-operative commonwealth, is worthy of the name of revolutionist. Therefore I am in favor of leaving the per capita tax just as it is, and we will get a small enough amount of money to carry on the work of the organization even with the 25 cents per capita tax.

DEL. SHENKAN: I would like to ask a question. Is there any provision in this resolution which provides for a reduction of dues? Is it not merely the reduction of the per capita tax?

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair understood it to be a reduction of the per capita tax.

DEL. LINGENFELTER: I would like to put a concrete question to the mover to reduce the per capita tax. In Springfield, Ill., the tailors went on strike. We had two members belonging to the tailors. One remained in the shop working. The other went out on strike. He came to me for advice as to applying for strike benefits, and I advised him

to immediately apply to headquarters for support. I don't know whether he did it or not, but I held that since he went out on strike and stood by working men who were on strike he had the same right to support as though he belonged to a tailors' local. I would like to have an answer to that question.

DEL. HAVER: A point of order. Under the rules no member is allowed to speak a second time until other brothers have spoken.

DEL. FRENCH: I think we have enough to talk about on 'the general per capita tax and the reduction or non-reduction of it. Is the point involved in this point of order merely the matter as applied to recruiting locals?

THE CHAIRMAN: The original proposition applied only to recruiting locals, but the amendment applies to all locals affiliated with the I. W. W.

DEL. FRENCH: Does that state that all locals shall pay only on the 8 1-3 cent basis?

THE CHAIRMAN: Fifteen cents, the amendment is.

DEL. FRENCH: The amendment is now before the house?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

DEL. FRENCH: Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to speak on this. This is something that I have got to take the floor upon, I cannot help myself. The original motion I did not think it worth while to take the floor upon, because I believed that the sense of the delegates would be that the recruiting local does not need to be discriminated in favor of particularly any differently from a local union of any other kind. But when it comes down to the concrete proposition of having all local unions or all members pay a certain per capita tax from the locals, that per capita tax to come to the general office directly from each member of the I. W. W., there comes in the proposition where I have got to take the floor not only from my personal view of the situation, but from the instructions of those who sent me here.

There are somewhere between three and four hundred members of the I. W. W. in Paterson, N. J., who are pretty nearly all in the textile industry. It is one of the things that I have been telling not only the textile workers, but the railroad workers, of New York and vicinity, and other poorly paid industries of the East; wherever I have had a chance to talk I have pointed out that I believed this convention would give us a chance to organize the East. Now, we have been hampered in two ways in organizing the East. In the first place, the general office sent us a stick as a general organizer. In the second place, we are hampered by the per capita tax of 25 cents being considered too high, because the local unions that would be organized could not set their dues high enough to have any working fund to work upon, and for the reason that the rank and file of the workers not only in the textile mills but in many other industries were unable to pay high enough dues to have 25 cents coming to the general office or to a department or to a national industrial union and have enough left to carry on any propaganda work from the local.

Now, I know the East. I have lived and worked in Rhode Island and Massachusetts. I know the field in New Hampshire; I know the field in Maine; I know the field in Connecticut; I know the field in New York and New Jersey. I have worked in the cotton, in the wool partially, and I have worked in the other industries as well. I know the railroad industry. I know the difficulties we are up against from actual personal experience, the difficulties that we are up against in the East, particularly in New York and New England. In that country there are, not tens of thousands but hundreds of thousands of slaves



who are miserably paid. I can realize that a man who has grown up in a western town or city cannot grasp the situation that prevails in the East. The man who has grown up in a mining town cannot realize what it means to live in Lowell, Mass., as I do. He cannot realize that you can walk down the streets of Lowell, Lawrence, Fitchburg, Clinton, Lancaster or any of these towns—and they are not towns; Lawrence has 75,000, Lowell 85,000, and some of the others more population—and the banks of the river are lined with slave pens that look more like penitentiaries, and the tens and hundreds of thousands of slaves in those mills get pay ranging from \$1.50 a week up to \$9 or 10; \$12 is the highest.

I have worked in those mills. I have got broken bones to certify to the fact that I have ground my life out in those mills for the miserable wages that are paid there. I know the conditions that I speak of, and I know the difficulties in the way.

Why has Rhode Island remained unorganized? I know all those towns in Rhode Island from personal contact with the people that live in them, and I know they are unorganized because they feel that with the miserable wages that are paid in those mills that they cannot get enough dues from the workers in those mills to enable them to pay 25 cents per capita tax and have enough left in the local to carry on the work with.

For that reason I believe that were a 15 cent per capita tax—I know; I don't say I believe; I know—that were a 15 cent per capita tax allowed to us we could organize them. I know electrical workers in New York who are working for \$1.40 a day. Realize what that is to live in this town—where it costs more to live than it does in Chicago—on \$1.40, \$1.45, \$1.55, \$1.70; \$2.50 is the highest amount paid to the street railway men in New York City. Think of it, living in a place where you can't get a shack, one fit to live in, under twenty dollars a month, where the cost of living is high. Ask those men to pay high dues in an organization, and they absolutely won't come into it. I have got hundreds of names of men who work in that industry, for that big corporation that controls the street railways, who are willing to pay as soon as we strike this financial proposition out and to join the Industrial Workers of the World. They have got confidence enough and have given us their names for that reason.

I know we can organize Rhode Island, we can organize all those great textile industries of Massachusetts that are now unorganized because of the fact that the pure and simple unions cannot take them in. We can organize them and we can give them a chance to come in. But we cannot give them a chance to come in when they know that they are not able to pay the high per capita tax. Take the city of Lawrence. I have worked in the Everett and Pemberton mills and others—

(Here the gavel fell.)

DEL. KLEESE: I will give him my time.

(Similar expressions were heard from other delegates.)

DEL. FRENCH: I would like to speak because this is a vital point; this thing is vital to me and my organization. I thank the delegates for giving me their time.

I have worked in the mills in the city of Lawrence. Take the Everett and Pemberton mills; they are owned by one corporation. The weavers in those mills run a whole bunch of looms, it doesn't matter how many they run. The weavers and slash tenders are the best paid men. The weaver when a mill is running full time makes from \$8.50 up. There is a whole lot of women working for \$5, \$6.50,

and \$7, but the best weavers make \$8.50 to \$10, up as high as \$11. The best get \$11 a week. And always without fail in the summer time the Everett is shut down for from two to six weeks. The Pemberton is shut down from four to six weeks. This applies generally to the cotton industry.

Del. McCue, who I believe originally came from New Hampshire, knows about this. Take those big slave pens in Manchester, it is the same thing, where tens of thousands work in one mill. There are 6,000 in the Amoskeag alone. Now, not only do they shut down absolutely, but for from four to eight months out of the year they are running four days a week—four days a week, mind you. Now, two-thirds of their employees are working for less than \$6 a week. I know that from personal experience.

Now, how are those people going to pay 25 cents per capita all the year round? How are those people going to be held in line in a cotton workers' organization in one of those mill centers where we need them? We do not want money. We want money to run the organization, it is true; we want money to carry on our propaganda, it is true. But our aim is to organize the working class so that we have a line upon the rank and file that work in that industry, to prepare ourselves to take and hold those mills. Not to build up a pure and simple defense fund, to have them believe that they are going to work upon something that will pay them strike benefits; not to build up an organization that is imbued with the pure and simple idea that we are protecting ourselves to have another strike to get 10 cents a day more for chasing twenty or thirty looms.

We want to reach the working class. We want to get them massed together, to enable ourselves to do that. When you come to the numbers the amount of finances at that lower per capita will make up the difference. We have been hampered in the East on that, and as a result we have got but a small organization. You compare the amount of per capita tax paid in the East with the amount that would be paid were we enabled to get those hundreds of thousands into line, and wouldn't the general office be better off financially as well? If you could send a man down into Fitchburg, Clinton, Lancaster, Lawrence, Lowell and Worcester or up into Manchester to see those men you could line up those textile workers. We have hundreds of thousands I know of that can be brought in line. Won't the finances at the 15-cent basis fetch the general office more money than the amount they have been getting up to now? Won't we do better on the other financial basis? But the main point is that we want to organize those workers, and we cannot do it on the 25-cent basis. That is the way the people that sent me here have instructed me. Of course, it is my own impression as well; that is why I talk so earnestly. They instructed me to strive to have a 15-cent per capita tax established in this organization to enable us to go out and organize not only the silk mills. A few decker men like Del. McKnight in the silk mills and men like Del. Haver can make \$20 a week. A few of these cotton weavers who have the best jobs and run the old-fashioned single ribbon loom and some on the double-decker loom, two looms, can make that amount, \$20 a week. But in that same mill are a little group of men all chasing a little bunch of looms. There were girls and boys working for \$3 a week, \$3.50, \$4, \$5, up to \$6 a week in the Glendale mill where the strike was. I have got a list and Del. Haver has also a list of the wages paid. There were three or four \$13 men, and a few \$12 men, a little higher number of \$11 men, and a little string of \$10 men, and a little longer string of \$9 men, and all the rest were down below

\$6 except a number of girls who were getting \$6. Six dollars was the highest paid girl, and all the rest were below that. Now, that is starvation wages in any city or town in the United States, and in the cotton and woolen districts it is worse than that. Anybody who has ever lived in a cotton or woolen town must know that they live in the direst poverty, and it is because of the immense amount of the product that is turned out by the machines that have been introduced in those mills, and because of the fact that they are continually having their store houses piled to the roof with goods, that they shut down the mill four days a week or two days a week. A weaver makes the best pay he can during the few weeks the mills are running. The result is that the average wages are away down and you cannot get those people to pay high enough dues to enable the local to have anything if you are going to have a 25 cents per capita basis. For that reason I stand here as one representing not only directly the people who have sent me here, but speaking and feeling the sentiment of the textile workers among whom I have lived and worked, who want to be organized but who do not feel that they can make a success because of this barrier of 25 cents per capita that is in their way. We want that class of people in with us to enable them to fight with us the capitalists who are persecuting our brothers in the pens. If the great body of textile workers had had the true spirit instilled into them with the knowledge of the things that have happened it would have been different in the woolen strike, and it would have put a different complexion on the Moyer-Haywood demonstration. And another thing, with the 15 cents per capita tax we can go to a town and call all those people together and get them into the I. W. W. You will find that not only will there be a different complexion upon this demonstration but you will find that there will be a greater drawing together in other parts of the country as a result of the example set by those men in lining up with us. But we have to give them a chance to line up. Therefore I hope the delegates here will decide to adopt the 15 cent per capita tax, and give us a chance to organize the working class to prepare ourselves for getting this organization into the industries as they are managed or controlled, so that we can all the sooner get in shape for taking and holding the products of our labor and the machinery of industry. (Applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Have you got the amendment, Mr. Secretary?

DEL. KINNEALLY: The amendment is that the per capita tax be 15 cents, local dues 25 cents, initiation fee not higher than two dollars.

DEL. FORBERG: Is that the committee's report?

THE CHAIRMAN: To save time in this body, I believe the convention is prepared to vote on the proposition.

DEL. RICHTER: I want to state that the intent was to make 15 cents per capita tax the amount paid to the general organization by those local organizations that don't belong to the department, leaving the department tax as it is, individual members 25 cents.

#### PARTIAL REPORT OF ORGANIZATION COMMITTEE.

DEL. PARKS: As a member of the Committee on Organization I rise to a question of privilege.

THE CHAIRMAN: State your question of privilege.

DEL. PARKS: The question of privilege is that the Constitution Committee has referred this identical subject over to our committee and we have taken action, and if we can report regarding this one point we won't have to report on the same thing again and bring the

same question before the house again. I ask the privilege of reporting our findings now.

DEL. SIMS: I move to grant the request. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair is unable to see how you can report while this committee is before the house.

DEL. PARKS: The convention having referred the matter to us, they can grant us the privilege of reporting and disposing of the whole matter, because it relates to the same subject matter.

THE CHAIRMAN: If there is no objection you will have that privilege.

DEL. PARKS: All right. Resolution No. 22, from Local 148, Toronto, and also Resolution No. 8, from Locals 61, 161, 284 and 38, all making requests for less dues and embodying the same subject matter. Resolution No. 8 was referred directly to the Committee on Constitution, asking for a sliding per capita tax based upon the class of wages and to be proportionate. The committee refers this matter to the incoming administration with the recommendation that they be empowered to provide a per capita tax consistent with the class of wages, provided this convention does not otherwise dispose of this question. That is our report on this question.

DEL. FOOTE: I move that we adopt this last report.

DEL. HOLMES: I ask for a point of information before voting. May I rise to a point of information?

THE CHAIRMAN: State your point of information.

DEL. HOLMES: I would like to ask if this only applies to the per capita tax; that is, if every organization has to pay the 15 cents per capita tax, that won't affect the fact that if they want to charge more they can, 20 cents or something else. Is that correct?

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair is unable to tell you what it means, to be frank with you. I understand this resolution, but the other one I don't. The vote will occur on this resolution or the amendment to the resolution.

DEL. FISCHER: I would like to have the floor because I am instructed on a special matter by my local.

DEL. KINNEALLY: The amendment is that the per capita tax be 15 cents, local dues 25 cents, and initiation fee no higher than two dollars or a maximum amount.

DEL. McCUE: To whom does that apply?

DEL. RICHTER: There is nothing there about dues of individual members, is there?

THE CHAIRMAN: It applies to all locals affiliated with the I. W. W., any department.

DEL. FISCHER: Mr. Chairman and brother delegates, I come from a local composed of hotel and restaurant workers. I was instructed to vote for 15 cents dues—that the dues of the locals shall not amount to more than 15 cents; that all the money that goes out of the local shall not amount to more than 15 cents. It means in other words that the headquarters tax shall be 15 cents. Furthermore I was instructed that I was to do my best to lower the initiation fee as low as possible. If we can abolish it we shall abolish it. Now, I understand very well that to run an organization you need money. Furthermore we understand very well that a small membership with high dues will not produce as much money as a large membership with small dues. Now, the situation in the East was described by Del. French. I possibly might add a few more words concerning the special industry in which I am working. Generally speaking the whole of the large membership of the working class in the East is absolutely so poorly paid that

they cannot exist as human beings. They simply make a living that I for my part would not like to live. Take the industry in which I am employed. I may state that four-fifths of all the employes do not average 65 cents a day. Now, can anybody with a sound mind tell me how a human being can live on 65 cents a day? I as an individual am able to make possibly \$100 a month, but that is possible only with 20 per cent that are employed in that industry, on an average. I can state that this \$100 a month is not sufficient for me and my family to make a decent living. In order to have a decent living I want to have a home consisting of three or four rooms, and I want a table set with something substantial; I cannot eat hash every day; I must have something else. And my family is of the same opinion. Going through the hotel industry, we will start in the top of the house. I work in a hotel where there are 200 employes consisting of chambermaids, porters, pot washers, dish washers, bus men, waiters, cooks, firemen, engineers, and the manager. Amongst all these people there are five who get a decent wage. That is, the steward, the head waiter, the chef, the head bartender and the manager. Now come the waiters with a wage of \$25 a month where they get tips, and tips are debasing to them; I for myself would not for an instant take them. After these come the omnibus men at \$20 a month. Some of these are married—

DEL. HESLEWOOD: I rise to a point of order. We do not want to hear all about the wages of every locality and district in New York. I know the men are discouraged in the East. I am not in favor of reducing dues in the West, but I would reduce them down to 5 cents in the East, though we can afford to pay \$3 out there. But I hope we won't take up too much time in explaining a lot of different details. We have heard about the wages in the textile industry and now we are going to hear about the hotels.

DEL. FISCHER: I only wanted to state the conditions in the East.

DEL. HESLEWOOD: I know you did.

DEL. FISCHER: If you wish to pay 25 cents you are simply going to keep the people out, when the organization ought to be strengthened by taking them in. For that reason I make a motion to reduce the dues to 15 cents and cut all initiation fees out.

THE CHAIRMAN: The secretary will call the roll.

DEL. RICHTER: Unanimous consent.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection to granting unanimous consent to concurring in this amendment?

DEL. HOLMES: I will have to vote no. Does that fix the rate of dues at 25 cents per capita all over?

THE CHAIRMAN: The per capita dues is all it fixes.

DEL. PARKS: Regarding this vote I want to state that in my opinion the issue is not clear. I do not understand what I would be voting on, what would be the effect of my vote, and it is all jumbled up in my mind.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Secretary will read the amendment.

DEL. HESLEWOOD: Isn't it just as you state?

DEL. PARKS: I will have to vote no anyhow, because I do not think the issue is well defined and I think it would be well to refer back to the Committee on Constitution so we can decide one question at one time. We have got three or four questions before the house now.

DEL. KINNEALLY: Amendment that the per capita tax be 15 cents, members at large 25 cents and initiation fee not higher than two dollars.

DEL. HESLEWOOD: No objection. I would like to ask for a unanimous vote. I don't believe there is any objection to that.

(Calls of "Vote," "I object," "Roll call.")

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection to giving unanimous consent?

DEL. FORBERG: I object if it is going to take any of the membership out of the Industrial Workers of the World. I am perfectly willing to make the per capita tax low for a few localities, but not for the entire membership.

DEL. FOOTE: That is my position.

DEL. AUGUSTINE: Is an amendment to the amendment in order?

THE CHAIRMAN: It certainly is.

DEL. FOOTE: I move as a substitute for the whole the adoption of the committee's report on the resolution.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair will rule that substitute out of order. I do not see what that is going to accomplish.

DEL. AUGUSTINE: I think that an amendment to the amendment if properly made would settle the whole question and would cover the whole ground, and I would offer this: That the per capita tax shall remain at 25 cents per month except where in the judgment of the General Executive Board the per capita tax must be lower.

DEL. MARKLEY: Second.

DEL. SIMS: A point of order. Isn't this a violation of parliamentary usage, to save the calling of the roll, to start a debate upon the proposition after we start to call the roll?

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair has not been conducting this convention under parliamentary usage. It has been trying to conduct it to get through with the business.

Roll call demanded. The roll was called and resulted: Total vote, 422; Yes, 309; No, 111.

THE CHAIRMAN: The amendment is carried. The Secretary will proceed to read.

#### STRIKE PAY.

DEL. KINNEALLY (resuming report of Constitution Committee): In reference to payments to strikers. It is from Local 162, Belleville, Ill.: "Strike pay shall not be allowed to strikers until those in each particular case have been out on a legalized strike or been locked out for a period exceeding seven consecutive days, and the strike allowance for seven consecutive days shall be uniform and shall be regulated by the General Executive Board and shall be paid only to those who were actually working when the strike or lockout began and who were called out or locked out caused by such procedures as are in conformity with the provisions of this constitution; providing, however, that the General Executive Board may make provisions for those who were not working at the time when the conflict started. This authority may be used to a very limited extent in extraordinary cases only." We do not concur.

On motion of Del. Foote the report was unanimously concurred in.

#### PERSONAL STATEMENT BY DEL. KINNEALLY.

DEL. KINNEALLY: Mr. Chairman, as secretary of the committee I am through. But as a question of privilege I would like to have the floor for a few moments, just for a few moments. Mr. Chairman and brothers—

DEL. TULLAR: "Fellow workers."

DEL. KINNEALLY: Or, fellow workers: When and before I came to this convention I was convinced that there was something wrong

at headquarters. I landed here and was convinced that something was wrong. After the first day's experience or the second day's, I found that our headquarters, or rather our General Executive Board, were composed of men that were either blindly reactionists or fakirs, or, better put, grafters. There were other men in this convention that thought likewise. I made an exception, or rather I recognize that there were exceptions in that Executive Board, and the presentations made to this body prove that idea to be correct, and those two exceptions are our General Secretary and our Member of the Executive Board, Bro. Riordan.

DEL. HOLMES: Hear, hear.

DEL. KINNEALLY: And I came to the conclusion that the next Executive Board and the next set of general officers must be men of different caliber; men with the determination to carry out the work laid down by the Industrial Workers of the World. When the nominations were made on this floor today other men of my thinking spoke to me and requested me to stand for the nomination of Assistant General Secretary-Treasurer. I know my ability and I know the spirit that animates me in this revolutionary movement. I have been through, in the labor movement for the last twenty years, several physical encounters, and I stood ready if necessary to go through another one to carry on the work of this revolutionary industrial organization. I therefore allowed my name to stand as a candidate. But let me say that after the nominations had been made the election took place and I received the highest number of votes in this body, I was informed and I now understand that I must take hold of this place immediately. I have worked for a concern twenty years, and I have a family and I am situated in that position that I am unable to take hold of this office, no matter how much I would like to assist the comrades in the coming fight, in the coming battle for what is right; I am unable to take hold immediately of the office to which I was elected, pending the referendum vote. For that reason I must decline the honor conferred on me today. I do it very reluctantly, for the reason that I felt it was my duty, and felt that the time had arrived when men of my stamp—if I must say without egotism—must take hold of this movement and aid and assist in putting it on a foundation that it has never stood on before. For that reason I accepted the nomination. I thank the comrades who foisted this office on me, and I feel that in leaving the work in the hands of Comrade Foote or Bro. Foote the work will be as well done as it would be if I was in that position. Now, with this explanation I hope that you will accept my resignation as a candidate for Assistant General Secretary-Treasurer.

DEL. FITZGERALD: Mr. Chairman, I object to accepting this resignation, on the ground that I have heard from several individuals that this man—

THE CHAIRMAN: Del. Fitzgerald, the Chair will rule that you are out of order unless you have a motion to make.

DEL. FITZGERALD: Am I out of order?

THE CHAIRMAN: You are out of order unless you have a motion to make.

DEL. FITZGERALD: I move, then, that the resignation of Comrade Kinneally be not accepted by this body. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded that Fellow Worker Kinneally's resignation be not accepted. You have heard the motion; are you ready for the question? The Secretary will call the roll.

**DEL. FITZGERALD:** It has been the will of this class-conscious body of working men to place this man at the helm of this organization because they thought that he was a class-conscious revolutionist; a man that was fit to be in that office; a man that was fit by the choice of this convention to be brought forth and stand there on his past record. Now, we hear men say that Comrade Kinneally is this and Comrade Kinneally is that, and the Comrade belongs to the S. L. P. Now, the S. L. P. in its past record and the S. L. P. as it stands today is clear and clean, and that is the reason why I stand on this floor today—

**DEL. HESLEWOOD:** A point of order. We know who Del. Kinneally is, all right.

**DEL. FITZGERALD:** The reason why I take up the S. L. P. is that the S. L. P. has opposed this nomination and is bringing pressure to bear on this assembly. That is the reason—

**DEL. HESLEWOOD:** I rise to a point of order. We are not discussing politics here, and the brother is not speaking to the motion at all.

**DEL. FITZGERALD:** Therefore I say to you men that Comrade Kinneally has just got up here and his last remarks have been fabrications. He is willing at the present time to accept this office if the revolutionists of this country want to put him in office. And they want to put him in there, and I stand as one man that will say that we must have him there by the dictation of this convention.

**DEL. KINNEALLY:** I want to deny that the S. L. P. has any influence whatsoever on my actions here today or since I entered this convention. I have a wife and family. I have been away three weeks, and if I were to take charge of this office today and stay here I don't know when I would get home. I left a place that I must go back to and respectfully and decently resign if such is the case. When I accepted the nomination, as I said before, I understood that the matter was going to be referred and that ninety days would be given, if I was elected, to go back and get ready.

**DEL. FITZGERALD:** I wish to state to the Chair this: The reason I state this is that Comrade Foote came to me today and told me such, and he cannot deny it on the floor of this convention, that if Kinneally would withdraw it would leave him the next candidate for the office. I am here for what is right—

**DEL. HOLMES:** I wish to say that I voted for Bro. Kinneally and the majority of us voted for Bro. Kinneally because we want Bro. Kinneally. The majority of us do or he wouldn't be here. We want Bro. Kinneally because he is a leader, not because he is an S. L. P. man or organizer, but whatever kind of man he is, we know he has fought the battles of labor for years and he would be the right man in the right place. That is the reason we want him. Now, I don't think Bro. Kinneally should decline. I maintain this, that he is to settle it in a way to suit his wife and family. We can put a substitute in his place until he comes back, and then he can assume his place. We want him to be there. I don't want Fellow Worker Foote. I want Kinneally, and the other men who voted with me want him also. Let him go and see his wife and family and let us put a substitute there until he can get back.

**DEL. FOOTE:** Mr. Chairman, this matter has come up, and the delegates know that there are no secrets here on the floor of this convention. I know of none on my part, at least. I would gladly resign in favor of Bro. Kinneally, or withdraw, but the conditions are so that I do not feel that I could do so, and I had that feeling



when the meeting adjourned, but conditions have so shaped themselves that it could not be done. Bro. Kinneally has resigned. I accept the resignation. We all know the conditions existing today in S. L. P.-ism. It is going to be pointed out, and I as a non-partisan have accepted this office.

DEL. PARKS: I want to rise to a point of order. It has been stated here that Bro. Kinneally was elected by a majority vote. That would infer that more than half of us voted for Kinneally. I want to maintain that he was elected by a plurality vote and not by a majority vote. I want a ruling.

DEL. LINGENFELTER: A question of information.

DEL. PARKS: I want a ruling.

DEL. HAVER: I wanted to ask a question of information. There are ways of getting on this floor if you want. You don't want to knock now—

DEL. DE LEON: As a point of information, I want to ask the Secretary whether he would be able to get along without an assistant for the next month.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: I would be able to get along for six weeks, provided I can keep the office force that I have at the present time; for the next six weeks, but no longer.

DEL. DE LEON: Could you get along without assistance for three months?

SEC. TRAUTMANN: I believe with the support that is in the office I would be able to do so.

DEL. LINGENFELTER: Now your question of information.

DEL. HAVER: I don't want to interfere, and I am not going to say another word to the convention.

DEL. LINGENFELTER: Now I am going to ask as a question of special information. Did Fellow Worker Kinneally come out flat-footed and say "I hereby resign," or did he tender his resignation? If he has tendered his resignation it is up to us whether we accept it or not. But if he positively resigns it makes no difference what we do, he won't accept the office. For instance, here is our fellow worker over here; I get after the fellow during a strike; I think I can lick him, but he is much bigger than I am and he says no. Well, I ought to take his word for it. Comrade Kinneally is a big fellow, and if he should come out and say no, it is no, and we can't get away from it. Now, if he positively says "I hereby resign," and does not tender his resignation, we will have to accept it. I would like to know about that.

THE CHAIRMAN: I don't know what your point of information is, brother delegate.

DEL. AUGUSTINE: I want to say in reference to this case that I would not be in favor—

THE CHAIRMAN: Let me try and find out the information that Del. Lingenfelter wants, if I can.

DEL. LINGENFELTER: I will try and find out another way.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have the floor, Bro. Augustine.

DEL. AUGUSTINE: I am not in favor of accepting that supposed resignation of Comrade Kinneally's.

DEL. MARKLEY: A little louder.

DEL. AUGUSTINE: I am not in favor of having Comrade Kinneally's resignation accepted. The reasons he has given here for resigning are not sufficient. They don't suit me, and I know with the explanation and the answer given by Bro. Trautmann to Comrade De Leon's question that he could get along for six weeks without assist-

ance; provided he had the office force, that he could get along without Kinneally for that length of time. Meanwhile Kinneally could settle his affairs in New York and come on here and take his place where he belongs, and since that is his only reason for resigning I would not be in favor of accepting it.

DEL. COX: Mr. Chairman, there is one point that those who have spoken have not touched. Have we any assurance that Fellow Worker Kinneally will be elected? These three names are to be submitted to a referendum vote. Now, there should be some provision made for some one to assist Sec. Trautmann until this vote is in.

DEL. AUGUSTINE: That is right.

DEL. COX: And that substitute would cover the excuse that Kinneally has made. There is no excuse for the declination or resignation.

DEL. AUGUSTINE: Exactly; that is my point.

DEL. TULLAR: I want to carry out the argument of Fellow Worker Cox here, being one of the bunch here that has been victimized. If we ask Fellow Worker Kinneally to throw up a situation that he has held for twenty years and go to the expense of moving his family from New York to Chicago and then find that the constituents of ours, don't elect him; what would we be up against? He is up against himself without a job, in a city that is foreign to himself and family, and he has got to start life again. If any of you people think that is a snap, just go and get a job and keep it. But I for one know that it is not a snap, for I have been victimized in all ways.

DEL. HESLEWOOD: I believe we are here to expedite business and get along. I am going to ask Kinneally if he will go back to his work, or wherever he comes from, and wait till the referendum vote is taken, and accept the position if elected. In the meantime Bro. Trautmann will work with such office help as he has. I ask if Bro. Kinneally is willing to do that. That is all I want to know. (Applause.) The report of the Committee on Good and Welfare is due. The committee has not reported. We don't know when our turn comes, but we have not reported so far.

THE CHAIRMAN: There is a motion before the house. What disposition do you desire to make of it?

A DELEGATE: I move to lay the resignation on the table. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection to laying this resignation on the table?

DELEGATE: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: If not, the Chair will declare that it is carried.

DEL. FISCHER: Is there anything before the house?

THE CHAIRMAN: It strikes the Chair it would be in order to adopt the report of the Committee on Constitution as a whole.

#### DEL. DUNCAN AND CONSTITUTION COMMITTEE.

DEL. DUNCAN: Bro. Chairman, I do not think that report is yet complete. The secretary of the Committee on Constitution Committee has read a part of the resolutions that were submitted to them for their consideration and reported on them, but I know that there are a great many resolutions that have been submitted to that committee which they have not read before this body or any recommendation made one way or the other in the way of taking them up seriatim. They have taken up and reported on only a part of the resolutions that were submitted to them. Now, almost all the other committees that have been reporting here have reported on everything seriatim, one item by

itself, and I think that this committee ought to do the same thing. I object to accepting that report as complete at the present time.

DEL. HESLEWOOD: I move that the report of the Constitution Committee be accepted as a whole. (Seconded.)

DEL. PARKS: They may not be through yet.

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded that the report of the Constitution Committee be accepted as a whole.

DEL. DE LEON: When the secretary of the committee said he was through I was surprised. Del. Duncan is right. There are several other things that we have acted upon. In regard to Del. Duncan's proposition, I did not hear that reported. I suppose he has that in mind, hasn't he? I suppose you have in mind that proposition that you made in regard to the Preamble.

DEL. DUNCAN: Mine was among them. I believe there were also others.

DEL. DE LEON: I do not remember the others. I remember those, and I know that Sec. Kinneally did not report upon them, so I would have to vote against the motion to accept the committee's report as a whole. I do not know how it comes that he has not reported upon them, because we acted upon them and endorsed upon them "non-concurred in"—recommended adversely, as to those. I remember those; there were five of them on amending the Preamble.

DEL. HESLEWOOD: I withdraw the motion. I didn't know there was anything more to come.

DEL. RUGG: I withdraw the second.

THE CHAIRMAN: If there is no objection the motion will be withdrawn. Has the Resolution Committee any report to make?

DEL. RYAN: Let that committee go till tomorrow morning.

THE CHAIRMAN: Ways and Means.

#### REPORT OF WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE.

Del. Duncan of the Ways and Means Committee made the following report:

"The Ways and Means Committee report as follows: Meeting held Wednesday, Sept. 26, 3 P. M., at Brand's Hall. Present: Mullady, Kohl, Duncan and Hannemann; Hall absent. Bro. Duncan elected Chairman. Bro. W. J. F. Hannemann elected Secretary. Meeting also held Saturday morning, 8 o'clock, Sept. 29, 1906.

"On Resolution 24, in reference to raising funds for a test case on the right of the I. W. W. to hold open-air meetings, we recommend the establishment of an emergency fund to be drawn upon for trying test cases on the right of the I. W. W. to hold open-air propaganda meetings and providing for any other contingencies. We further recommend that contributions be received, and that fifteen per cent of the net proceeds of all social affairs held by I. W. W. locals and bodies be applied to the emergency fund."

DEL. DUNCAN: If you wish to hear the communication I will read it. It is a communication coming from Toronto No. 24.

(Objection heard.)

DEL. HESLEWOOD: I move to adopt the report of the committee. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It is moved and seconded to adopt the report of the committee. What is your pleasure?

DEL. VEAL: Mr. Chairman and delegates of the convention, experience has taught me this last seven years as a slave on the firing line, that the moment we go into the capitalist courts and allow lawyers to go there and fight the battle and pay our money to them, that

we don't get anything from it, and we might as well make up our minds to begin with the agitators who go out, that they have got to go out and defend their own cases in the courts, and when we do that we will win out, and that is the only way we can win. I am opposed to going and giving any more money to lawyers to defend the right of speech. If the agitators can't do that and support the constitution and stand on it, we are a failure to begin with.

DEL. RICHTER: I make an amendment that the matter be referred to the incoming Executive Board.

Motion seconded and carried by unanimous consent, with the exception of Del. Moore.

#### CLEVELAND STRIKE BENEFITS.

DEL. DUNCAN (continuing report): The next resolution was No. 27, in reference to loans made to the I. W. W. to provide a fund for paying strike benefits, from Tobacco Workers' Local No. 89, Cleveland, Ohio, strike. We recommend that the amount of \$815 due to the creditors covering the balance of strike benefits paid to strikers of Local No. 89, Cleveland, Ohio, loaned on Sept. 28, 1905, be paid back out of the defense fund in installments of \$150 per month until paid, beginning with October, 1906, and if necessary we replenish the defense fund from the general treasury if the treasury will permit it.

DEL. LINGENFELTER: I move to concur.

DEL. RUGG: I move an amendment. I recommend that the amount be paid at once from the general treasury.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: We haven't got it.

DEL. RUGG: You will have to raise it.

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded that it be paid at once from the general treasury. What is your pleasure with this motion?

DEL. FISCHER: As our treasury, as I heard mentioned, is bankrupt, I move to table the motion. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any objections to the motion to table?

DEL. JOHNSTON: Do I understand that this will be provided for at some future time?

DEL. TULLAR: I am a little bit mixed on the wording of that motion. I disagree with the wording of the committee. I believe it is possible for the general office to pay that entire amount in one lump. I think that should be done.

DEL. AUGUSTINE: A point of order, that there is no debate on the motion to table.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is correct.

DEL. SHENKAN: This was all disposed of.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection to tabling?

DEL. RUGG: Why, certainly, I object.

DELEGATES MOSKOVITZ and REID: I object.

THE CHAIRMAN: With those exceptions we will call it tabled. So ordered.

DEL. AUGUSTINE: Now, the motion is before the house to concur in the report of the committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion to concur in the report is the next thing.

DEL. AUGUSTINE: I am in favor of that motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: State your motion. We have not got the motion yet.

DEL. AUGUSTINE: The motion is that we concur in the report of the committee, that \$150 a month be paid.

THE CHAIRMAN: Who made that motion?

DEL. AUGUSTINE: Didn't some one make that motion?

THE CHAIRMAN: Not yet.

DEL. AUGUSTINE: Then I move you to concur in the report of the committee. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded that we concur in the report of the committee.

DEL. SHENKAN: I rise to a point of order. This whole proposition has already been disposed of at the previous session. We decided to pay this money; what is the use of making a motion again?

THE CHAIRMAN: There is no use at all.

DEL. TULLAR: That is the way I understand it, the matter was disposed of when the Committee on Strikes and Grievances was reporting. I would like to have the minutes read and see what disposition was made of the report of the committee with reference to this matter about the stogie makers' strike.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: As to the stogie makers the case was disposed of and we were instructed to pay it.

DEL. TULLAR: Then it is out of order.

DEL. FOX: I move that this resolution be referred to the incoming board. That is where the other matter was referred, and it will go to the same place. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It is moved and seconded that we refer this to the incoming General Executive Board.

DEL. VEAL: As one of the members of the Strike Committee I will say that we recognize as the delegate from Cleveland states that there has got to be immediate action. He claims that we should pay the whole thing as quickly as the money can be paid. We recognize that this organization cannot pay the money in a day or an hour or that quick. I voice the sentiments of the delegate that he wants the money to take back with him. The question is: This organization has endorsed the action giving the money; now, how quickly can they pay it, or what will he report back? That is what he wants to know.

THE CHAIRMAN: The General Secretary-Treasurer will know.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: I told the delegate from Cleveland that he should wait until the newly elected Executive Board would meet, because I believe we will not be able to pay the full amount at once. If we can make arrangements to pay the full amount at once I realize that that may avoid more trouble in Cleveland. But it all depends on the financial conditions and the settlement of the embarrassment in which we have been brought in the last few days.

DEL. FOX: Mr. Chairman, the reason I made the motion was because of the former action. We passed a motion agreeing to pay this bill and left it in the hands of the Executive Board to take such action. That is the reason I make this motion to put this resolution into the same hands, in conformity with our former action.

DEL. ROTKOVITZ: As I understood, action was taken here a few days ago on behalf of that case and I thought it was settled. As I understand the position the Industrial Workers of the World are in today, it would be necessary for me to stay here another week and probably two weeks after the convention adjourns. I can't go back to Cleveland without having the debt liquidated, for the boys are sore from the fact that when the money was advanced it was advanced by the women or men who were workers in the city of Cleveland, and it was stated by the employers that if they were aware of the action taken the stogie makers would never make a strike. They depend a great deal on it. If they think the Industrial Workers of the World

are embarrassed and will not be able to pay they will be sore; if I go back to Cleveland and tell the boys I didn't get the money yet, which has been promised several times before; they were told that they would get the money in May, and then in May they were told the convention will take place in June; in June they were just as far away; they were told September. Now it is September, or September is past, and if they will not get their money they will be disappointed and all kinds of remarks will be made, and the echo will be heard amongst the employers, and the employers will take advantage of the situation. Therefore, I say that if the Industrial Workers of the World want to avoid any serious conflict with the employers today they should work for the people of the Cleveland local so that a strike may not be called on account of the men not getting their money.

DEL. REID: Mr. Chairman, there is a saying that "hope deferred maketh the heart sick," and I believe from what the comrade says here that those men in Cleveland that have been working along, who have shown the proper class spirit in a practical way, should not have been dealt with in the manner that they have. There is something wrong in the dealing with them. It should have been paid long ago. It was what might be called a debt of honor of the Industrial Workers, and I think that some very strong recommendation should be made to the General Executive Board that that matter be liquidated immediately if possible. I can understand the position that Del. Rokovitz is in in going back there empty-handed after the convention promised two or three times. They will simply say it is the same con game, and no doubt about that, and when the cap makers and the rest of the A. F. of L. people get hold of it they will simply make capital out of our condition.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: The stogie makers of Cleveland have never paid any tax. They were plunged into that fight and they only paid five months' tax, and since that time we tried to liquidate the debt as quickly as possible. But we can't do more than we have in our power to do. If we would have the finances to liquidate it tomorrow it would be done. But can you devise how we can raise the moneys at once? I told Del. Rokovitz this morning when he came to me that we were embarrassed at the present time, and as soon as we find a way out of it he will get the money as speedily as possible. The convention went on record to liquidate the debt. Having waited for this length of time, I believe they could wait for it a week longer, and then I believe the organization will be in a position to liquidate the entire debt at once. But the organization as such, you understand, was never treated in any way unfair by the Industrial Workers of the World.

DEL. ROTKOVITZ: A point of correction. I wish to correct the General Secretary. He said the tobacco workers were not treated in a mean way. Not so, by no means; they were. They got in a situation where they were treated in a mean way. We are in bad condition and we have been for the last eight months. We had to support men, thirty or forty, and we are supporting them today, supporting them by ourselves on the small wages that we are making, and the Industrial Workers never supported them since they had that first fight. I will not say they were denied any benefits, but they were not supported by any means. Not a cent was sent to Cleveland, and we don't expect much that way. But on the other hand, in regard to our General Secretary's statement that we did not pay tax, I say they did pay tax. It was a suggestion made by General Secretary Trautmann that "We will liqui-

date this in stamps, and that will pay you so much by the supplies you may get." And we have been getting supplies, \$40, \$50, up to the amount of \$50 a month. Lately, when the number of members in that city was reduced or diminished, we didn't send in only \$30 or \$25. But his suggestion to us himself was that they owed the money and they would credit as so much supplies was taken. So we did pay amounting to \$350 or \$355. If calamity did not come or a crisis in our industry, this question would not come up now and the money would be paid off long ago. But the fact is the bosses take advantage and they have raised the price of commodities in order to squeeze the workingmen and break down the organization. Now is the time for them to crush the organization and cause them to lose their confidence in the Industrial Workers of the World. I hope the Industrial Workers of the World will not take advantage of their fellow workers.

(Question called for.)

THE CHAIRMAN: The question is called for. Is there any objection to having this referred back to the G. E. B. to be acted on as quick as possible?

DELEGATES: No objection.

THE CHAIRMAN: Hearing none, it is so ordered.

DEL. DUNCAN (continuing report of Ways and Means Committee): On resolution No. 57, in reference to request for a speaker to debate on industrial unionism vs. A. F. of L., we recommend that volunteers be called for to respond to the call from the Brotherhood of the Daily Life of St. Louis, Mo., for a speaker to debate on Sunday, Oct. 7, the President to select the speaker, and if no volunteer responds, the G. E. B. to use its best resources to respond to the call.

THE CHAIRMAN: What will you do with the report?

DEL. KLEESE: I move to concur.

No objection, and carried by unanimous consent.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: It should be understood that this is a short time. I received a letter yesterday calling for a mass meeting. The A. F. of L. has refused to take part. They are going to arrange a mass meeting, and they want to know who are going to be the speakers so that they can put them on their bills, without cost to the I. W. W.

DEL. DUNCAN: It was a part of our recommendation that volunteers be called for.

DEL. TULLAR: There is a car load of volunteers here. Let them take their pick.

#### TRANSPORTATION DEPT. PRINTING BILL.

DEL. DUNCAN (report continued): On Resolution 59, in reference to bills for printing from Galitz & Pabst against the Transportation Department and Local No. 26 of the Transportation Department, totals \$78.60 and \$11.60, we recommend that payment for these bills be advanced from the general fund.

It was moved and seconded to concur.

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded that we concur.

DEL. SHENKAN: I would suggest that perhaps it would be well to embody in the motion that this firm be no longer patronized since they have done as they have.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is a suggestion.

DEL. DUNCAN: On what ground?

DEL. SHENKAN: They prosecuted this organization, didn't they?

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Not in any way. They wanted to foreclose

a mortgage against the Transportation Department about six weeks ago on this bill. I said they should not do it because that would drag the entire organization into court. They promised not to do so, and then they sent this communication to the convention. Now, since that time we received the original bills, and Fellow Worker Cox was with us today when a man from one of the firms that had bills against the Transportation Department or debts demanded payment within ten minutes. Isn't that correct. And they even threatened court proceedings. I paid part of the bill that I knew was due by the general organization, but this I absolutely refused. There are now bills coming in from the Transportation Department never contracted by the general administration, over the signature of McCabe, O. K'd on the bills, and the manufacturers expect us to pay those bills. Now, the convention should decide whether these bills will be paid.

THE CHAIRMAN: State the amount of the bills.

DEL. DUNCAN: The amount of the bills is \$78.60 and \$11.60.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: I wish to state that they demanded immediate payment, and I challenge contradiction that the demand for immediate payment was instigated by the former President of the I. W. W. There were two witnesses to that when this matter occurred in the office.

THE CHAIRMAN: What will you do now? Is there any objection to passing this over to the incoming administration?

DELEGATES: None.

THE CHAIRMAN: Hearing none, it is so ordered.

#### ORGANIZER FOR BAKERY WORKERS.

DEL. DUNCAN (continuing report): On Resolution No. 26, in reference to organizing locals in the food stuff industry, we recommend that this request made by Del. E. J. Foote of Bakery Workers' Industrial Union No. 224 of Wichita, Kas., be referred to the Organization Committee and that an organizer be sent to Wichita, Kas., as soon as possible.

DEL. TULLAR: I move that it be referred to the incoming Executive Board.

DEL. PARKS: I make the point that as it is to be referred to the Organization Committee, there is no action to be taken on it till the Organization Committee reports.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection? If not, I will declare it carried.

#### ASSESSMENT FOR ORGANIZERS.

DEL. DUNCAN (report continued): On Resolution No. 53, in reference to assessment of one dollar to pay for expense of sending out organizers and that the rate of pay be three dollars per day and expenses, said expenses not to be more than three dollars per day and railroad fare, to be submitted to a referendum vote of all members of the I. W. W. and if carried to take effect at once. We recommend that the request be granted and the proposition be submitted to a referendum vote, and we further recommend that the expenses be one dollar per day and railroad fare instead of three dollars per day and railroad fare.

DEL. LINGENFELTER: I move that the original resolution in the hands of the Transportation Committee be substituted for the recommendation of that committee. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It is moved and seconded that the original resolution be substituted instead of the recommendation of the committee. Are you ready for the question?



DEL. TULLAR: I am not in favor of either. Three dollars a day expenses is too much, and one dollar is not enough. Split it in two and you have got the difference.

DEL. LINGENFELTER: I ask that the resolution be first read and the substitute will be before the house.

DEL. TULLAR: I mean expense accounts.

DEL. LINGENFELTER: Never mind about expense accounts. Del. Duncan read the original resolution, as follows:

"Whereas, It is clear by the reports of our officers that the funds will not permit sending out organizers and keeping them in the field, and,

"Whereas, It is important that the I. W. W. have as many organizers as possible in the different departments as well as general organizers; therefore, be it

"Resolved, That an assessment of one dollar on all members of locals and the members of all departments, to be paid in four instalments of 25 cents per month, to be turned over to the general fund to pay the expense of the organizers, and be it further

"Resolved, That the wage of the organizers shall not be more than three dollars per day and expenses, such expenses not to be more than three dollars per day and railroad fare. Be it further

"Resolved, That these resolutions be sent to a vote of all the membership of the I. W. W., Railroad Department, Metal and Machinery Department and W. F. of M., and if carried, same to take effect at once.

"A. Lingenfelter."

DEL. SCHWEINBURG: Mr. Chairman—

DEL. AUGUSTINE: I am opposed to the whole thing as it is here. I do not see any reason why we should state right here what the salary and expense money is to be for the organizers. We don't have to do that. Furthermore, I think it is almost ridiculous to submit it to a referendum vote of all the organization to say what the organizer's salary shall be and what his expense money shall be. I think this matter of organizer's salary and expenses should be left to the present Executive Board to decide. I think that is the best way it can be done. There are conditions where an organizer could work in a certain locality at \$18 a week and \$1 a day expense money, perhaps half a dollar a day expense money. Then again there are conditions where he would need \$3, and I think that this matter should be left to the discretion of the Executive Board, and it would be settled properly and would not have to be sent to a referendum vote of the organization to decide. I object to a certain stipulated sum.

DEL. VEAL: Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the whole proposition.

DEL. PARKS: I rise to a point of order. There is nothing before the house because the committee has made no recommendation on anything and there has been no motion made.

THE CHAIRMAN: There is a motion before the house.

DEL. DUNCAN: If you will permit me, I can inform the brother that we have made a recommendation.

DEL. VEAL: Mr. Chairman and Fellow Delegates, I am opposed to the whole thing, from this view point: You can go into some places in the eastern country and you can get a meal for 25 cents. You go into Silverton, you go into Telluride, you go into the Montana towns outside of Butte, and then you go into Idaho and in many cases you have to pay a quarter or 50 cents for a meal that you could get in the city of Chicago for 15 cents. Now, then, for us to pay a uniform \$3, you can't get at it that way. Probably one organizer hasn't got as

luxurious tastes as another fellow. Now, these differences must be taken into consideration, and the only ones who can judge of the territory that the organizers are allotted to are the Executive Board. They can judge these things better than the membership can, because it depends a great deal on the geographical layout where we are as to what we can set a basis on. But I am not in favor of the dollar-a-day proposition or the three dollar-a-day proposition, as far as that is concerned. We will have to take those things into consideration.

DEL. TULLAR: I want to speak a little on this from experience. When I was located in the city of Chicago as organizer for Chicago, I think the General Secretary-Treasurer will bear me out that my expense account did not exceed on the average two dollars per week. I have been north, and, living as economically as I could, I found in the city of Minneapolis that it cost me eight dollars a week. The very next week I came over to St. Paul, and I got better room and better food, and all it cost me was four dollars a week. Hence I believe that the organizers should put in an itemized account of every day's expenses, every meal and every night's lodging, and let the General Executive Board decide whether it is legitimate or not. Now, I want to say another thing in regard to this salary proposition, and I tell you before I make the statement that I know there are but very few that will agree with me. But my personal convictions are that no organizer, no organizer of this organization should receive for a salary one cent more than the capitalistic value of his labor power. If I can earn \$20 a week in the shop from the capitalist class, I should be entitled to that much as an organizer. If the capitalistic value of my labor power averaged but \$9 a week, then I claim that I should be entitled to but \$9 a week salary. If you are going to pay the officers of this organization an amount that exceeds the capitalistic value of their labor power, then you establish an incentive that will influence that man to perpetuate his job. But if he only gets the wage that the capitalistic master pays him, then he has no incentive to perpetuate that job.

DEL. DUNCAN: I want to say, in behalf of the committee's action, that the reason we recommended that this be cut down from three dollars expense to one dollar and that the salary be the same, was that we considered that that was fully as much as the average working man could earn. Figuring that at \$3 a day for seven days is \$21. One dollar expense a day is \$28 a week in addition to car fare. Now, then, in some localities, of course, the expenses will cost more than they will in others. But we do not say that it has got to be just so much. It may be less than a dollar a day in some cases, and if the organizer should take a few cents out of his three-dollar-a-day salary I don't believe it would hurt anything. But I don't agree and the committee don't agree in its action here with Bro. Tullar's sentiments that the organizer should get the same salary that he is paid by his capitalist master. I might go over to New York and get a job at seven dollars a week. Now, I might go to some other part of the country and get a job at fifty dollars a week if I was an exceptional man, but I would not be a better man at organizing on account of having worked for a particular salary for any particular capitalist master. I think we ought to regulate the wage so that an organizer will fare about as well, perhaps a little better than the average worker. But I don't think he ought to rise into another class altogether. I think anybody that has class spirit enough to make a successful organizer for any working

class movement ought also to have class spirit enough to fare alike with the average working man.

DEL. HOLMES: I wish to say that I agree with Bro. Duncan. I agree that we ought to have a fixed scale for organizers. It may be that it will cost a little more in some places than others. Well, if such is the case, he can take a little out of his salary to make up for it. I don't agree with Fellow Worker Tullar, as I don't believe in capitalist scales at all, although unfortunately I am compelled to live under them. We have just elected a Secretary and Assistant Secretary and decided that they should both get the same salary. Brother Tullar says if a man is worth \$7 a week to his capitalist master he should get \$7 a week as an organizer; and another fellow that gets \$20 a week from a capitalist master should get \$20 a week as an organizer. I maintain that a bricklayer may get six dollars a day and not be as good an organizer as a pick and shovel man that gets \$1.60 a day. (Laughter.) If we make any distinction at all it should be in regard to the quality of the organizer, not in regard to what the capitalist master paid him. We don't want to make any exception. If a man is not fit to be an organizer, then I don't believe he should be sent out. And I maintain the same should prevail for all other organizations. I think it is a perfectly fair report that the committee has made, and we should accept it and abide by it.

DEL. LINGENFELTER: The reason I introduced that resolution is not upon the premises that have been discussed by all the speakers. The premises are that the treasury is depleted. For all practical purposes the treasury is busted, when it comes to sending out organizers, for all practical purposes. I hold that if a man is an organizer, if he has any ability at all as an organizer, he is entitled to at least enough to live, and if that man be a man with a family I hold that he has the right to return to his family the amount that he would get if he were working for wages in a factory. And I can assure you that when I work eight hours a day six days a week my wife at least gets \$15 to \$16 a week; that is, I would have it in my pocket to turn over. Now, the arrangement to start an assessment at 25 cents for four months is sufficient with the funds in the general treasury to enable the incoming administration to send out organizers. No one seemed to talk against that. They seemed to have lost sight of it. On the second proposition, instead of sending out, to my knowledge, first-class organizers at \$10 a week, it will raise them up to at least wages that they can exist upon, \$3 a day. Now, mind you, my resolution says "no more than \$3 a day," a very limited amount, to my mind; no more. I heard much kicking about expenses of organizers and I know from personal experience in the city of Chicago that for weeks and weeks for four years I spent pretty nearly a dollar a day expense in one organization that I belonged to out of my own pocket for street car fare and otherwise.

THE CHAIRMAN: Your time is up.

DEL. LINGENFELTER: Is my ten minutes up?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

DEL. SCHWEINBURG: I was the first man to ask the floor when that resolution was read, and I have not got it yet.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have got it now.

DEL. SCHWEINBURG: Now, Mr. Chair, I am in favor of the motion or recommendation from the committee, to make it three dollars. But I tell you right here that you can't get 25 cents out of the membership

of the I. W. W. You may say "yes," and several others may say "yes," but I speak from experience. If you ask if there are organizations with members that are willing to pay a dollar, even willing to pay a dollar a month for three months, I would say yes. But if you try to send out a referendum vote to the I. W. W. membership throughout the country to assess every member 25 cents for four months, you will find out that you won't get the money. It is no use to talk about low-paid organizers. I wish we could pay the organizers more than three dollars a day and all expense necessary. But first let us ask the question if we can raise the money from our membership. I say no. If you send out a referendum vote to the general membership you will find out that I speak the truth here. Now, you have heard here that the men are fighting for 15 cents per capita tax because they can't afford to pay 25 cents to the general organization, each member. They will come and say, "You have assessed your members 25 cents a month for the general organization for organizing purposes." The answer you will receive will be, "No, we won't do it, we can't do it." Now, a different thing will do. If the Committee on Ways and Means had said, "We recommend that the general office send out a call for voluntary assessments on the membership of one dollar as soon as they are willing to pay the money," no local would object to it. But you won't make a dollar out of it as long as you send it to referendum vote.

DEL. FRUEH: There is a proposition before us, as I understand, to refer to the membership the question of raising one dollar per member, that amount to be used for the organizers' fund. Now, as to the assessment in itself, speaking for the territory from which I come, I will state that you will not raise it. They have instructed me to work against the proposition to reduce the dues to 15 cents. They pay the organizing out of their own pocket. Now, do you mean to tell me that they are going to dig down into their pocket and raise another dollar from that territory? You will not get it there, and I don't believe you will get it from anywhere else. I don't believe in the 60,000 you can probably get one-fourth of them if you ask for voluntary contributions throughout the country from the organizations. We have had assessments this last year, but it shows that voluntary contributions may help you out, if you can't get money otherwise. But in the present situation you are up against it.

DEL. MOSKOVITZ: I move that the whole matter be referred to the incoming administration. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It is moved and seconded that the whole thing be referred to the incoming general administration. Is there any objection?

DEL. DUNCAN: On behalf of the committee I believe it is my duty to object to referring that part of it which relates to the salary of organizers. We ought to establish some wage scale for all of our employees and have it written down in that constitution so that we know where every dollar of our money is going when we pay it. The membership wants to know it. There is nothing that they have been crying for more in the constituency that I represent. That has been the severest criticism that we have been living under during the past year. They say "We are paying our money into a blind receptacle. We don't know where it goes; we don't know whether the President of the I. W. W. gets a \$5,000 salary the same as the A. F. of L. or not, and we don't know whether he puts up at a \$12-a-day hotel or not." And we ought to have that right there in black and white. Then we can go

before the working class on a fair basis and tell them what we are and what we are going to do.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion to refer is still before the house. Is there any objection to referring this to the incoming Executive Board?

DEL. FRUEH: I object.

DEL. SHENKAN: I call for a segregation of the question into two parts.

THE CHAIRMAN: No, that is not the question.

DEL. KLEESE: We can't vote on a dozen things at once.

THE CHAIRMAN: The whole thing can go to the General Executive Board, I suppose.

DEL. VEAL: Mr. Chairman, if you do what he desires, that delays it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Roll call.

DEL. SCHWEINBURG: What is the roll call? On the motion to segregate?

THE CHAIRMAN: There is no motion to segregate.

DEL. SCHWEINBURG: He made a motion to segregate.

THE CHAIRMAN: I didn't hear a second.

DEL. KLEESE: I second it.

THE CHAIRMAN: He said it ought to be, but made no motion.

DEL. SHENKAN: I make a motion that we segregate it. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Now there is a motion to segregate. The question is on segregation. If there is no objection it is so ordered. Now it is segregated, and you have got it where you want it.

DEL. JOHNSON: I will offer as a substitute to the motion that the recommendation of the committee in reference to the assessment be referred to the Executive Board, and that they be instructed to send out a call for a voluntary assessment for the purpose of raising a fund for organizers.

DEL. FOX: That motion is clearly out of order, as the motion to refer is before the house. You can't make another motion except it is a privileged motion, and that one is a regular motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have segregated it; now what is your pleasure?

DEL. SHENKAN: The proposition before the house was in reference to the payment of wages, fixing the wages for organizers. Now I move that that portion of the committee's report referring to wages of organizers at three dollars per day be concurred in. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It is moved and seconded that that part of the recommendation of the committee giving the wages of organizers be concurred in. Are you ready for the question?

DEL. SHENKAN: I want to include in my motion that we pay for six days a week.

THE CHAIRMAN: For six days a week.

DEL. KLEESE: I would like to speak to that motion just a minute.

THE CHAIRMAN: Can't we vote without talking?

DEL. KLEESE: Yes, you can vote against it. I want to put before the house the unreasonableness of the dollar-a-day expense for men to organize in Montana. If you go before them you will not get anybody to work there.

DEL. VEAL: I rise to a point of order. The question before the house is that we are on the wage question. Is my point well taken?

THE CHAIRMAN: It is well taken. This is to regulate organizers'

wages at three dollars a day for six days a week. Are you ready for the question? Is there any objection?

DEL. JOHNSON: I don't believe in that, because an organizer when he goes out on the road works seven days a week.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are not in order. You have got to speak to the motion.

DEL. SHENKAN: I will substitute seven days if there is no objection.

THE CHAIRMAN: All right, then your suggestion is now accepted. That suggestion is embodied in the motion, that they get three dollars a day for seven days a week. Any objection?

DEL. McKNIGHT: How much expense is allowed under that?

DEL. VEAL: A point of order?

THE CHAIRMAN: That is another question.

DEL. SHENKAN: The recommendation of the committee is that the wages be three dollars a day and expenses, not more than one dollar and car fare.

DEL. PARKS: I would like to ask one question. A fellow comes into a union camp where it is an eight-hour day and he works two shifts, will that be called two days?

THE CHAIRMAN: We will get along without that point.

DEL. AUGUSTINE: A point of information. A motion was made to refer the whole matter to the Executive Board. Now another motion was made to segregate the two questions before the house.

THE CHAIRMAN: Now it is segregated.

DEL. AUGUSTINE: Now I want to know from the Chairman or Secretary what part of that motion we have before the house at the present time.

THE CHAIRMAN: Fixing the minimum wages of organizers—it is already fixed if you are ready to vote—at three dollars a day for seven days.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: The amendment fixing standard of wages and expenses is segregated.

DEL. AUGUSTINE: I have not got my information yet. I want to know this: I want to know what the two questions are before the house. Let us have them first. There are two questions.

THE CHAIRMAN: I will inform the delegate.

DEL. AUGUSTINE: All right.

THE CHAIRMAN: If you paid attention to what was going on instead of holding meetings you would know. The question before the house now is that the standard wage be three dollars a day for organizers. The other will come up under a motion. The other is segregated.

DEL. FISCHER: I move the previous question. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: The previous question is called for. Is there any objection? If not, it is so ordered.

DEL. FISCHER: Now we are voting on the motion.

DEL. SHENKAN: I call for unanimous consent.

DEL. FISCHER: A point of order. The motion before the house is to find out the standard wage of organizers. That was discussed.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, that was settled.

DEL. FISCHER: That is not settled. I asked for the previous question, that the previous motion be voted on.

DEL. TULLAR: A point of order. That motion was segregated on that question? Now, the call for the previous question embodies two distinct propositions.

THE CHAIRMAN: It involves two distinct propositions. The part as to the standard of organizers' pay is settled. Now the next vote is the segregation, and then you can call for your previous question.

DEL. FRENCH: Am I to understand that that part of the segregated question relating to the wages of organizers as moved by Del. Shenkan has been adopted?

THE CHAIRMAN: That has been adopted.

DEL. FRENCH: Because all these questions have mixed the whole thing up and I want to clear them.

THE CHAIRMAN: If you would pay attention instead of holding outside meetings you would know it. Read the last.

DEL. DUNCAN: The other part, do you mean, on expenses?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

DEL. DUNCAN: "We recommend that the expenses be one dollar a day and railroad fare."

THE CHAIRMAN: The recommendation of the committee is that for expenses one dollar a day and railroad fare be allowed. Are you ready for the question?

DEL. FISCHER: I move that this matter shall be referred to the incoming Executive Board. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded that this be referred to the incoming Executive Board.

A DELEGATE: No objection.

DEL. HESLEWOOD: I would like to ask how many times that has been referred to the Executive Board.

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been several times.

DEL. McCUE: A point of order. In order to facilitate the work of this convention I would like to suggest to you that you kindly retire from the chair and let St. John be recalled.

THE CHAIRMAN (Del. Markley): I second the motion.

DEL. KLEESE: I want to go on record as opposing three dollars a day seven days a week.

DEL. RUGG: I move that we adjourn. We have got lots of work to do, and I don't see any use in wasting time. I move that we adjourn. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: The question is to pass this to the incoming administration. Is there any objection? Hearing none, I declare it so ordered.

The convention then adjourned until nine o'clock Wednesday morning, Oct. 3.

#### SIXTEENTH DAY.

Wednesday, Oct. 3, 1906.

#### MORNING SESSION.

The convention was called to order at nine o'clock by Chairman St. John.

The roll of members was called by the Secretary.

#### AUDITING COMMITTEE ANNOUNCEMENT.

DEL. FOX: Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Auditing wish to retire to complete their report. We will report this forenoon if we can, and if not we will have it immediately after dinner.

## COMMUNICATIONS.

The Secretary read the following communications:

Oct. 2d, 1906.

To Delegates in Convention:

Fellow Workers: Word comes to me as I was on my way to the depot tonight, that Del. Fitzgerald was circulating the rumor that I was leaving for the purpose of prejudicing the Industrialists of the West against Fellow-Worker Kinneally.

Coming from the source it does, I do not consider it necessary to stay over another day for the purpose of repudiating such a false charge, and I entrust this to Fellow-Worker Markley to read to you.

I consider Bro. Kinneally a personal friend and regard him as one of the stalwarts in the revolution, a man who is too broad to listen to such effeminate gossip and too sensible to stoop to personalities.

As for myself, I am accountable for my own acts, and as a revolutionist am guided by the inexorable dictum of the class struggle.

I go forth from this convention buoyant with hope in the fakir-free working class organization we have struggled so hard for.

Your fellow-worker,

E. J. FOOTE.

Seattle, Wash., Oct. 2.

Convention, care W. E. Trautmann:

Revolutionists, accept congratulations from Metal and Machinery Local 79, I. W. W., Seattle, on victory over reactionaries.

C. G. MOBERG, Rec. Sec.

## WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE, RESUMED.

THE CHAIRMAN: When the convention adjourned last night the report of the Committee on Ways and Means was under discussion.

## AMALGAMATION OF UNIONS.

DEL. DUNCAN (reporting for Committee on Ways and Means): On Resolution No. 55, in reference to an organization having amalgamated with another union and the Secretary believing that within two months they may be ready to join the I. W. W., and requesting that we send him full information, we referred same to the Organization Committee. That was all of our action on that subject.

(On motion unanimously concurred in.)

On Resolution No. 28 in reference to assessment of one dollar for the purpose of starting a strike fund, we recommend that the same be not approved.

In reference to changing wording on label from "Tobacco and Cigar Industry," to "Tobacco Industry," we recommend that it be approved.

(On motion the portion as to strike fund unanimously concurred in.)

DEL. SHENKAN: I move that the balance be referred to the incoming Executive Board in reference to changing the wording of the tobacco label.

(Seconded and unanimously carried.)

## CAP-MAKERS' AFFAIR.

DEL. DUNCAN (continuing report): On Resolution No. 69 in reference to the cap-makers' affair: Whereas, unjust and libelous attacks have been published by the A. F. of L. cap-makers against the I. W. W. cap-makers' Local No. 177, New York; and whereas, charges have been preferred by the Cutters' Union, New York, A. F. of L. in the New York Industrial Council, I. W. W., against the Cap-Makers' Local No. 177, I. W. W. of New York. and whereas, an investigation



committee has been elected by the New York Industrial Council and is now hearing evidence in the case, we recommend that the General Executive Board be instructed to investigate the whole case and to publish their findings and those of the I. W. W. investigation committee elected by the New York Industrial Council to consider the charges, and if in the judgment of the General Executive Board the investigation in New York is prolonged beyond a reasonable time, that they publish suitable answers to the charges published by the A. F. of L. Cap-Makers.

It was moved and seconded to concur in the recommendation.

**THE CHAIRMAN:** It has been moved and seconded that the recommendation of the committee in this matter be concurred in. Is there any objection to granting unanimous consent?

**DEL. SHENKAN:** Does that imply that the General Executive Board is to go to New York and investigate the thing, or merely at long-distance range?

**DEL. RICHTER:** It is a New York investigation.

**DEL. SHENKAN:** It is the sense of the committee that that be left to the discretion of the General Executive Board, but that that committee get out a reply to that A. F. of L. libel as soon as possible.

(Motion to concur unanimously carried.)

#### PERSONAL—THE ANDERSON CASE.

**DEL. DUNCAN:** That finishes the report of the Ways and Means Committee. Signed by all the members. Now, on a personal privilege, if I may have the floor a minute. I have just received a communication from Spokane, Washington, in regard to one man there who has been acting in the capacity of an enemy to the I. W. W. There was considerable correspondence between there and this office on the subject last winter. There was a man there against whom charges were preferred for the misappropriation of moneys. My own membership cards will serve as evidence in the case that the custom there was to receive I. W. W. dues under an I. W. W. charter and to stamp the books in receipt for the moneys with the name of A. G. Anderson, Secretary, No. 222. When I came to Spokane he said that they had about eight hundred members in the I. W. W. from whom he received money that way. I believe the Secretary's books here will show that in all there were about 60 I. W. W. stamps to provide for that membership of 800 I. W. W. men during five months of their membership. Now, charges were preferred against this man, and the pure and simple union bunch that were supporting him there sustained him, although he was plainly proved guilty of the theft that was charged against him in the trial. The case was appealed to the General Executive Board here, and from all the correspondence that we received at Spokane we could not determine what action they had taken in the matter further than that Organizer Bohn came there with instructions to investigate the matter and with full authority to act. Shortly after that the I. W. W. mixed local there was reorganized and most of the other charters taken up. I won't go into the details regarding that reorganization fight; that would be a long story. But I just want to state briefly a little about what happened subsequently to that. The pure and simple bunch with their labor skate leader organized an independent local against the I. W. W. local which was reorganized in competition with both I. W. W. Mixed Local 222 and the A. F. of L. local in the same town. Subsequently this independent local received a charter under the A. F. of L. also, making two federal A. F. of L. locals in the same city. The A. F. of L., headquarters apparently found reason for chartering these two federal locals in the same town, for the reason that they thought they

could better fight the I. W. W. with a double instrument than with a single one. Shortly after that, it is alleged, and I believe the allegations were somewhere near if not quite authentic, that W. F. of M. men had come to Spokane wanting to join the organization that the W. F. of M. was affiliated with, and that this man Anderson represented that his independent local afterwards chartered under the A. F. of L. was the one for them to join, and that he had even gone so far as to use I. W. W. literature and I. W. W. application blanks in his representations. This as well as much of the subsequent action—

DEL. VEAL: A point of order. I take the position that if this convention was to go through all this information bearing on what has taken place within the last year we would be here a year. We recognize that these things will be done all over the country. What is the use of listening to that? I ask a ruling on this question.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair is of the opinion that your point is well taken.

DEL. DUNCAN: I will be very brief.

DEL. SHENKAN: I move that this matter be referred to the incoming Executive Board.

DEL. DUNCAN: I want to state that I have just received a communication this morning which I felt it my duty to submit to this body, a communication bearing upon the I. W. W. affairs. I don't want to rehash the history of this part of the movement there in Spokane to any great extent at all, but there is a great deal of evidence against this man, enough I am sure to convict him.

A DELEGATE: Which man?

THE CHAIRMAN: It would strike the Chair that if you have that in your possession you can't take it up before this convention. That is on the same line with others that have been received at this office.

DEL. PARKS: I rise to a point of order. Anderson is not in the Industrial Workers of the World today and we ought not to discuss it here. There are two sides to this I. W. W. fight, and if he is going to discuss it it will be a temptation for somebody else to discuss it. I believe he ought not to get on the floor, because I believe it is improperly brought up at this time.

DEL. DUNCAN: I am not bringing up this affair for discussion.

THE CHAIRMAN: The point is well taken. You rose to a personal privilege, and I can't see where you talked on the question at all.

DEL. DUNCAN: I am just bringing up a communication that I received this morning. I know there are two sides or three sides—

A DELEGATE: Read the communication.

DEL. DUNCAN (continuing): Or many sides to the history of this case, and there is no doubt but an investigation should be made. That is all I have to say. But the communication I received this morning encloses photographs of A. G. Anderson and his assistant. I ask permission to file them here with the Secretary of the organization and recommend that he make the best use that he sees fit to make of them.

DEL. SHENKAN: I move that we proceed to the next order of business. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Reports of Officers has got a supplemental report to make.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Committee on Education and Literature is the next committee.

#### COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LITERATURE.

Del. French of the Committee on Education and Literature presented the following additional report:

DEL. FRENCH: The Committee on Education and Literature recommends the adoption of the following:

## POLITICS AND THE MINERS' MAGAZINE.

"Whereas, The policy of the I. W. W. towards political parties is to keep hands off political parties;

"Whereas, The Mining Department of the I. W. W. in the convention assembled in Denver from May 28th to June 13th of this year emphasized this policy by official declaration by the adoption of instructions to its delegates to the I. W. W. convention to the effect that the I. W. W. neither desires the endorsement of any political party and will not itself endorse any;

"Whereas, In violation of the principles of the I. W. W. in the premises and the official decrees of its own department, the Miners' Magazine did, in its issue of last June 7th, endorse a political party in the state of Pennsylvania, and in its issue of August 30th repeated the endorsement and aggravated it by assailing a rival party;

"Whereas, Such act of insubordination, by taking a hand in the conflicts between political parties, is conducive to mischief only; therefore, be it

"Resolved, That this convention condemns the action of the Miners' Magazine as calculated to impede the unification of the working class and thereby to impede the objects and aims of the I. W. W. in general and the Mining Department in particular."

It was moved and seconded that the report be adopted.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection to the adoption of this report?

DEL. PETRIELLA: Yes, Mr. President.

DEL. DUNCAN: I want to ask for information——

THE CHAIRMAN: Del. Petriella has the floor.

DEL. PETRIELLA: I object, Mr. President, to concurring in the report of that committee for the simple reason that the Miners' Magazine is not the organ of the Industrial Workers of the World, but it is the organ of the Western Federation of Miners and the right of control and censorship lies completely in the Executive Board of the Western Federation of Miners, not in us. That is all I have to say.

DEL. FRENCH: May the committee explain its position?

DEL. DUNCAN: I was going to ask for information as to what the committee recommended in regard to the report; if they recommend its publication broadcast or if they recommend that we make this affair public. I disagree with Bro. Petriella. The Western Federation of Miners is a part of the I. W. W., and of course any official organ of the Federation is necessarily one of our organs. It is a part of our organization. Now, then, if we cannot control that organ so that it will publish what we consider right I think it would be only publishing to the world a weakness of our own to publish its misdeeds. I think the first step, then, to take is to make that Miners' Magazine a right organ of this organization and to see that it is edited right.

DEL. FRENCH: Mr. Chairman and delegates, the sense of the committee on recommending this resolution lies in this: We assume that we have all got the sense of organization, despite the opinion of Del. Petriella, and that it is that the Western Federation of Miners or the Mining Department is a component part of the Industrial Workers of the World and as such the General Executive Board has the power to control these industrial unions and settle here any matters concerning the interest of the general welfare, and a matter of this kind is a matter outside of the direct internal affairs of that industrial department. It is a matter that concerns the general welfare, and is a matter of discipline in order that we may have an organization that instead of a rope of sand composed of autonomous groups that have no

sense of connection or discipline, that have no uniformity of sentiment or action, we would have a real organization that has some uniformity and that will stand for the same self-imposed discipline, such as we adopt when we adopt a general constitution. That was the sense in recommending the adoption of this, so that by condemning that action now it will serve as a warning to future editors of organs. And there will be a good many organs. For instance, Local 130 has got an organ in New York City that will undoubtedly develop into a pretty good sized paper after a while, and if they go off in one direction and another local goes off in another direction we have got just what we are speaking of, instead of a real organization. That was the reason why, and adopting this will serve to check any further tendency there may be to go off in this direction by any component part of the organization.

DEL. FLASCHKAMP: I move that the communication be laid on the table. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded that the communication be laid on the table.

DEL. FISCHER: Roll call.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called and the Secretary announced twelve votes in the affirmative.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is lost.

DEL. PARKS: Now, Mr. Chairman, let us thoroughly understand what this means. Some time last summer the Miners' Magazine published an article endorsing the candidacy of three members of the Socialist Party in Pennsylvania. When the editor does that as a member of the Industrial Workers of the World he violates the principle laid down in our Manifesto and in our Preamble. A local down East, I think it is a typographical union, takes exception to the article in the Miners' Magazine, and they, so I understand it, write to the Miners' Magazine protesting and also asking why he don't endorse members of a different political party, alleging that these members are members of the I. W. W. I also understand that they have written from a certain typographical union down East there a communication that was gotten up in a local of the Industrial Workers and setting forth reasons and asking that the S. L. P. be given a hearing in the Miners' Magazine, etc. Now, I think that those fellows in that typographical union were guilty of as great an offense as Mr. O'Neill was. I think that those fellows of the S. L. P. ought to have been big enough not to get down on the same level as Bro. O'Neill. If Bro. O'Neill did a wrong you can't make one right by making two wrongs. Their attempt to use the Miners' Magazine to get a hearing from that point of view, as I understand it is the case, puts them out of court, if you will allow that kind of an expression here. They are guilty of the same offense in a different way, not from the aggressive but from the defensive. Now, let us note another point. When this matter comes up in the Western Federation convention for the amendment of our Preamble that we endorse no political party and ask no political party to endorse us, it is properly referred to the Committee on Constitution. Now, the Committee on Constitution went out of their way to bring in a censorship of a part of the press. I maintain that is not a part of the function of the Committee on Constitution, to put a rider so to speak—that is what it was, a rider—upon the amendment to the Preamble in order to kill two birds with one throw and incidentally reflect something upon the actions of a department in a way to do something for the benefit of one political party and to the department of another political

party. Now, if that is the way they take it it seems to me that there is a censorship due to that Committee or Constitution, and it seems to me if I understand thoroughly that there is some censorship due to that typographical union if—

DEL. FRENCH: A point of order; that the question before the house is whether or not we shall adopt this set of resolutions.

DEL. PARKS: That is what I have been talking on.

DEL. FRENCH: The actions of the Constitution Committee are not under discussion and it is not on trial.

DEL. PARKS: I am talking this way because it came from the Constitution Committee to the Committee on Education, and I think it is relevant to say how the Committee on Education got jurisdiction of this matter. I am perfectly willing to have a censorship passed upon the Miners' Magazine; but I say it is just and right, if they have violated our principles on the political field or on a political question, I say not only the Miners' Magazine but every other individual in the Industrial Workers of the World ought to come in for their just and equal share of censorship, and that is the reason why I voted to table that resolution. Now, it is too late to debate that resolution. I don't want to talk upon it. I expressed my sentiments as concretely as I can by one vote. As to these accusations, no matter by whom made, I don't want to take the floor to talk on that. I will not make any motion, but my suggestion would be to refer this matter to the Committee on Press or to the incoming Executive Board. I think this resolution as shaped up here today is not broad enough to cover the field and express my views, and therefore I cannot support it and I will not support it.

DEL. DE LEON: Del. Parks finds fault with the action of this committee on the ground that it was transferred to the Committee on Education and Literature from the Committee on Constitution. Now, he proposes to pass it over to the Press Committee which would have likewise to pass upon it in their way, and then I suppose when it arose again he would find fault because the matter was transferred to the Committee on Constitution by the Committee on Education. The arguments of Del. Parks are very funny. I mean no insult, but they are of the nature of the arguments made by Sherman when he was defending McCabe for trying to unseat or keep out of the convention the contesting delegates. Sherman tried to make it appear that the contesting delegates had done wrong and had done so and so; saying that if they had done so and so, then they would be entitled to seats. This convention took the view that the original wrong doer, the wrong doer who did wrong without provocation, that his action could not be condoned by punishing those who may or may not have done wrong under provocation. Now, the status of the case as Parks put it is entirely different. It is not as he said. The Committee on Constitution did not go out of its way. To the Committee on Constitution was referred instructions from the Mining Department to recommend or make some recommendation with regard to the attitude of the I. W. W. on the political question. And it was fairly within the scope of the Committee on Constitution in that it was its duty to take cognizance of the fact that the political organ of the department that asked us took the position—it emphasized the position of non-intervention in the internal squabbles of political parties—that the very organ of that very department was at that very time doing the very thing that the department refused to condemn and which those delegates in this convention came instructed to oppose. He says the Constitution Committee exceeded its duty. In my

## SECOND CONVENTION PROCEEDINGS

opinion it is a proper rebuke to the editor. On the 7th of June the paper issued an endorsement, by name, of the Socialist party, by mentioning its candidates. Thereupon, under that provocation, a local in New York stated that those men that were endorsed were every one of them I. W. W. men.

DEL. FRENCH: A. F. of L. men.

DEL. DE LEON: A. F. of L. men, proud of their record. That action Del. Parks says is heinous; that if they endorsed any political party they should endorse the I. W. W. Whether that local was right or wrong, the principle, the model into which it cast its protest, certainly was correct. That principle was that the I. W. W. endorsed no political party; that it stands upon that principle. Now, that protest is published and the original endorsement is repeated in the next number, and then this language is used: "We refuse to retract one single sentence or word of that editorial." Then it goes on to state: "The Miners' Magazine is completely under the control of the Executive Board of the Western Federation of Miners, and its absolute ownership rests inside of the membership of the Federation." Also, "The Miners' Magazine, had it lauded editorially the I. W. W. candidates nominated by the S. L. P., it is probable that the membership of No. 244 would have given its benediction. We desire to say right here that the Socialist Labor party is not yet piloting the ship of the Industrial Workers of the World through the stormy sea of capitalism"—that is the language Sherman used. "We desire to say right here that the Socialist Labor party is not yet piloting the ship of the Industrial Workers of the World through the stormy sea of capitalism. There are thousands of other men as brave as the S. L. P. who have yet a voice in the councils of this organization, and they will not be used as a tail to fly the Socialist Labor party kite."

Then it goes on to say that the Miners' Magazine is autonomous, or that the Mining Department is autonomous. The constitution provides for autonomy in internal affairs. Will you say that it is an internal affair of the Mining Department of the Western Federation of Miners to endorse a political party in the East? The absurdity is obvious; the contradiction is obvious; the wrong is obvious. And it becomes all the more obvious when the reactionary bolting delegates of that department come here with the proposition that there shall be no intervention in political parties, and yet their organ is doing that same thing, and they do not find fault with it. Not only do they not find fault with it, but they condone it because from the laughter that met the statement of Del. McMullen that he had not seen it, every one in the convention knew that he did not tell the truth when he stated it. He knew what was done; he did not object to it, and yet he came here with instructions from his department taking the attitude which was not the attitude of the I. W. W.

I hold, Mr. Chairman, that this convention would have had the right to take cognizance of this action on the part of this paper. The convention might have been pardoned if it overlooked it, having so many other things to attend to. But once that department's delegates came here with that instruction that we shall not take a hand in the internal affairs of a political party, once they do that, by that action they not only justify but compel the convention to call their attention to the fact that their organ was violating the very instructions of this particular department. I for one hold that politics is not worth going across the street for by an economic organization such as the I. W. W. I hold that if the I. W. W. should go down another

organization of the sort will have to be built up. I consider that it is not only the cornerstone, it is all four cornerstones, it is the foundation work for the emancipation of the working class. Holding that, I am opposed—and my record is clear upon that—to mixing the question of politics at all times in this economic organization. And it is the duty of every one who rises to the high importance of its conception and is not sophisticated by curious points of law—it is his duty to rise and put his foot down heavily upon such an act, not only of insubordination, but such as the committee reports it to be; an act that does violence to our ends. It impedes the unification of the working class. That political unity that we aim at cannot be brought about by now having this organization take sides with this, that or the other political party. That political unity can only be the result of this organization keeping its hands off the squabbles between political parties, and then let itself be built so strongly that it compels a unification of political views and political methods.

For that reason I consider that recommendation of the committee as complete. I consider the Committee on Constitution would have been derelict in its duty if it had not done what it did, and since the convention decided to pass it over to the other committee it has done properly and its recommendation should be adopted.

DEL. PARKS: I want to ask the brother a question. He tries to place me before you—

DEL. DE LEON: How is that?

DEL. PARKS: Bro. De Leon tries to place me—

DEL. DE LEON: I insist upon a point of order. The gentleman rose to ask a question.

DEL. PARKS: I want to ask a question.

THE CHAIRMAN: Del. Parks, ask your question.

DEL. PARKS: Isn't it the proper function of the Constitution Committee to devise and propose legislation on which we are to act to bring in a constructive program?

DEL. DE LEON: Yes.

DEL. PARKS: Wouldn't the investigation of the alleged offense be rather a matter for a special finding of a committee appointed for that purpose?

DEL. DE LEON: No, and the facts are obvious.

DEL. PARKS: Judicial?

DEL. DE LEON: No, and the facts are obvious.

DEL. PARKS: Do you understand that I am absolutely opposed from my point of view, from what I have stated—that I have been opposed at all times and stand opposed now to having the convention consider the question of censoring anybody who has offended our constitution and preamble regarding our political position, or our position on political questions?

DEL. DE LEON: I do not understand the question.

DEL. PARKS: All right; I will have to state what I understand your attitude is as I understand it, and then you will understand my question. You have as much as asserted that I have maintained on this floor that this convention ought to take up the question of investigating this offense on the part of the Miners' Magazine.

DEL. DE LEON: I did not say that.

DEL. PARKS: You did not state that?

DEL. DE LEON: No.

DEL. PARKS: All right. I am in favor of this convention looking into the Miners' Magazine and everybody else that has tried to bring politics into this organization. That is all I have to say.

DEL. DE LEON: What I did say was that Del. Parks finds fault with the committee passing upon this because it was referred to the Committee on Constitution, and he claimed the Committee on Constitution had no original right to transfer it. Now, I say if you can derive a lack of authority in this committee to pass upon that matter because it began in the Committee on Constitution which you say had no authority, then your proposition when it was then passed to another committee becomes tainted to the same degree.

DEL. HESLEWOOD: I think we have heard enough from our side. We are anxious to vote, and I move the previous question. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection to granting unanimous consent to concurrence in this motion?

Delegates Flaschkamp, Petriella, Moore, Rogers and Dressler objected.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any other objection?

DEL. DE LEON: That is the previous question?

THE CHAIRMAN: If there is no other objection the Chair will declare the motion carried on the committee's recommendation. It is so ordered.

DEL. RYAN: The Committee on Resolutions is ready to report.

#### COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LITERATURE.

DEL. FRENCH: The Committee on Education and Literature has another item:

"We recommend that the General Executive Board be authorized to collaborate with and establish sufficient supervision over the management of all journals of departments, industrial unions or other component parts of the I. W. W. as to insure the required uniformity of all official journals of this organization."

DEL. PARKS: I move its adoption. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection to giving unanimous consent to the adoption of this report? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

DEL. PETRIELLA: I wish to be recorded as objecting.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is carried.

#### LITERATURE IN FOREIGN LANGUAGES.

DEL. FRENCH (report continued): Upon the suggestion of Del. Forberg regarding the supply of literature to new members we recommend that in view of the large percentage of workers who are unable to read English, all locals be urged to furnish a year's subscription to the Industrial Worker to those new members who read English and the equivalent of the price of said subscription in literature in their own language to those who cannot read English, wherever the initiation fee is large enough to admit of such being done.

On motion unanimously concurred in.

#### MANAGEMENT OF INDUSTRIAL WORKER.

DEL. FRENCH (report continued): We recommend that the management of the Industrial Worker, both business and editorial, be under the supervision of the General Executive Board.

Unanimously concurred in.

DEL. GOSS: I object to that because I believe the rank and file ought also to know that the Industrial Worker is our paper.



## EDITORSHIP OF INDUSTRIAL WORLD.

DEL. FRENCH (report continued): Again, we recommend that the editor of the official organ be elected by the convention.

Unanimously concurred in.

DEL. FRENCH (report continued): With regard to the communication from Patton, Pa., wherein it is stated that the local leaders of the United Mine Workers have threatened to encompass all the harm possible to the I. W. W. and are trying to poison the minds of the Catholic workers by telling them that the I. W. W. is a socialist organization, to join which would cause them to forfeit their membership in their churches and religious organizations, we recommend that in order to make easier the work of the organization in that district a special leaflet designed to offset such misrepresentations be prepared and issued in English and Slavonic for distribution there.

SEC. TRAUTMAN: And Hungarian, for there are more than 4,000 Hungarians.

DEL. FRENCH: In English, Slavonic and Hungarian, we will make it.

Unanimously concurred in.

## FIRST OF MAY.

DEL. FRENCH (reporting): In conclusion, in regard to observing the first of May as International Labor Day, we recommend that all I. W. W. organizations be urged to mark that day by appropriate manifestations of working class solidarity carried out in such manner as to express to their fellow workers the true significance of the day. That is in line with the General Secretary's report on the First of May. (Unanimously concurred in.)

## COMMITTEE ON RESOLUTIONS.

The following additional report was made by the Committee on Resolutions:

Whereas, the verdict of the majority is more to be trusted than the decision of a single man; and

Whereas, the majority must atone for all the mistakes and profit by all the wise deeds of social administration, whether it be by the administration of the majority or not; and

Whereas, the mistakes of the majority are due to ignorance; and.

Whereas, the suffering of the majority from its own mistakes is an educating factor, while the sufferings entailed by the mistakes of an irresponsible ruler tend to exasperate and not to educate; therefore, be it

Resolved, that, although the majority may rule clumsily and unwisely at first, all acts and decisions of the organizers and other officers of the I. W. W. which affect the general welfare shall be submitted to referendum vote, when it is called for, either of the whole organization or of the department or local most concerned; and be it further

Resolved, that no officer of the I. W. W., either local or general, shall have power to appoint committees or other officers except in cases of emergency.

Fraternally submitted by

C. H. DUNCAN,

Representing Local Union 222, Spokane.

DEL. AUGUSTINE: The committee recommends that this resolution be not concurred in.

DEL. LARKS: Mr. Chairman, I move to adopt the report of the committee. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded that the report of the committee be adopted.

DEL. DUNCAN: I make a substitute motion that the report of the committee be rejected and the resolution be concurred in. (Seconded.)

DEL. PARKS: I rise to object to the consideration of this question over here.

DEL. SHENKAN: A point of order. The subsequent motion which was made was a negative to the original motion and is therefore out of order.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair will rule that your point is well taken. Are there any objections to granting unanimous consent to concurrence in the report of the committee?

DEL. DUNCAN: I did not understand your ground for ruling that substitute out of order. I think it is offered here in accordance with parliamentary rules, and it is therefore in order. It was seconded right here.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair ruled it out of order from the simple fact that it was a negative to the motion.

DEL. DUNCAN: If we concur in the resolution it is a substitute.

DEL. PARKS: I will make another point of order to help you out, and that is that this resolution covers ground that has already been passed upon at this convention.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair will rule that that is well taken.

DEL. DUNCAN: I rise to a point of order also. My point is that this resolution covers ground that has not been covered by this convention as yet, and that ground is the power of appointment which is placed in the hands of our local president and in local officers generally, which we want done away with.

DEL. HAVER: I move the previous question.

THE CHAIRMAN: The secretary will call the roll on the motion to concur in the report of the committee.

DEL. DUNCAN: Isn't this question debatable? The previous question has not been moved.

A DELEGATE: Yes, it has.

DEL. SHENKAN: I move the previous question and ask for unanimous consent.

DEL. DE LEON: What are we voting on?

THE CHAIRMAN: The vote is on the motion to concur in the report of the committee. You are voting on that motion.

The roll was called and announced as follows: Total vote, 314; Yes, 303; No, 11.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is carried.

DEL. AUGUSTINE: The Committee on Resolutions has finished its work.

DEL. PARKS: I move that the Committee on Resolutions be discharged. (Seconded.)

(Unanimously adopted.)

DEL. FRENCH: The Committee on Education and Literature has no further report to make.

THE CHAIRMAN: If there is no further objection the Committee on Education and Literature will be discharged.

#### COMMITTEE ON ORGANIZATION.

The Committee on Organization made the following report:

DEL. PARKS: Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Organization has already made a partial report, which has been acted upon, and I begin

with the report of the committee in session Sept. 30, at 148 West Madison street. Meeting called to order by Chairman Parks. McDonald absent, stating to Parks that he declined to serve any more on the committee.

The first resolution taken up was No. 26, from Local 224, Wichita, Kans. Referred to the incoming general administration.

(Unanimously concurred in.)

#### RECALLING CHARTER.

Resolution 55, from Local Union 344, Philadelphia, Pa., stating that the local has joined the A. F. of L. The committee therefore requests that the general administration recall the charter and all other property belonging to the I. W. W. That is the committee's recommendation.

(Unanimously concurred in.)

SEC. TRAUTMANN: They have not joined the A. F. of L. Read that again, Resolution 55. I will ask Bro. Moskowitz to go back and get Resolution 55. He says they have not joined the A. F. of L.

#### LOCAL BY-LAWS.

DEL. PARKS (reporting): Resolution 15, from Locals 140, 50 and 41, received from Committee on Constitution, relating to Sections 1 and 2, Article X, By-Laws for local unions. The committee refers back to the Committee on Constitution with a recommendation that Article X above referred to stand as it is.

(Unanimously concurred in.)

#### THE PHILADELPHIA MATTER AGAIN..

DEL. MOSKOWITZ: This is a general letter. It states:

"I wish to inform you that Local Union No. 344 has decided at the last meeting to amalgamate with the former brotherhood Union 106, an independent organization." Well, that is almost just the same. The committee stands corrected. Bro. Petriella was the secretary at this time, and we dictated our findings, and probably he did not get it as we stated.

DEL. PETRIELLA: Mr. President—

DEL. PARKS: As chairman of the committee I will state that the committee will stand corrected. They have not joined the A. F. of L., but they have amalgamated themselves with a form of union known as No. 106, an independent organization.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: This needs explanation. That was done by the advice of the general administration of an organization known as the Butcher Workers' Union in Philadelphia. After we sent an organizer to the local the organization commenced to grow and the A. F. of L. union commenced to disband. The only way of getting the other butchers out of the A. F. of L. was to propose a plan of organization. That organization will come back into the I. W. W. after the amalgamation is perfected, provided we send immediately an organizer to Philadelphia to be present when the amalgamation takes place. That was the reason why that communication was brought before this convention.

DEL. MOSKOWITZ: I would substitute a recommendation that this matter be left in the hands of the incoming administration.

(Unanimously carried.)

#### PROTESTED DELINQUENT LOCAL.

DEL. PARKS (continuing report of Organization Committee): Resolution 48, from Local 27, Belleville, Ill., referred from Committee on Constitution embodying a protest against the action of the Committee

on Credentials in not seating the delegate whose local was put in bad standing by the neglect of the local financial secretary to perform his duty in remitting the per capita tax. The committee recommends that no duly elected delegate be debarred from a seat in the convention through any clerical error or official negligence provided official evidence is submitted to the convention on the matter.

It was moved and seconded to concur.

DEL. SCHWEINBURG: This is from the union in Belleville, Ill. Local 27 of the so-called old Metal and Machinery Department. A delegate was elected from this local union that was never a delegate to this convention. When the committee from the convention went over the books of the Metal and Machinery Department in the office they found out the local was not in good standing. That was not the fault of the convention committee, that was the fault of the proper officer. It would be the fault of the Secretary-Treasurer of the general organization if the local was not represented in the general organization. I cannot see how the Credentials Committee could act different than it did in rejecting the delegate. He has not got the money ready to pay, and he did not know anything about how things were before coming here. I cannot concur in the recommendation.

DEL. MOSKOWITZ: A point of order, that there is nothing before the house but this proposition. If delegates don't feel that this is proper they should not concur. The motion before the house is to concur in the recommendation.

DEL. SCHWEINBURG: At this time I cannot concur in the recommendation of the committee, as we would have no right to seat a delegate that was not in good standing.

DEL. PARKS: I will state directly that we provide in our report that no delegate shall be denied a seat through any mere negligence in the official acts of any local.

DEL. RICE: I have been in the same town where he comes from, and I know it was the fault of the secretary of that local. They instructed him to buy stamps for the Metal and Machinery Department, which he did not do. They told him to send money down to that department, which he did not do. When we went down there we found it was the fault of the secretary of that local, who kept the money himself.

Question called for, and report unanimously concurred in.

#### SLIDING PER CAPITA TAX.

DEL. PARKS (continuing report): Resolution No. 2 from Local 198, Toronto, Can., referred from Committee on Constitution, relating to a sliding per capita tax based upon the class of wages. The Committee refers this matter to the incoming administration with recommendation to provide a per capita tax consistent with the class of wages, provided this convention does not otherwise dispose of this question. Now, by your action yesterday the convention has acted upon this question, and therefore the committee will recommend that this be placed on file.

(Unanimously agreed to.)

#### BUSINESS AGENTS.

Resolution No. 11½, from Local 84, St. Louis, Mo., relating to local officers commonly designated as business agents. If you want to hear the resolution I can read it. The committee reminds Local 84 and all others of like mind, that "A rose by any other name will smell as sweet," and conversely. We therefore emphatically recommend that

all future I. W. W. organizers do fully instruct locals regarding the principles, scope and tactics of the I. W. W., from which it will follow "as night the day" that the evils enumerated and alluded to in Resolution from Local 84 will become a relic of capitalism and foreign to the I. W. W.

(It was moved and seconded to concur.)

**THE CHAIRMAN:** Are there any objections to concurrence in this report?

**DEL. TULLAR:** I believe as the committee reports. But having had experience in the past and an example right in front of us in Chicago, I think that the language of that should be explicit, and say that from here on no business agent so-called shall be employed under the direction of the I. W. W.

**DEL. PARKS:** I will state the reasons for our action. Whether you call him a business agent, organizer, walking delegate or what else, if you have got a big local you have got some business to be attended to. Now, I attended the Butte Workingmen's Union which is represented by Abbott on the floor of the convention, a night or two before I left Butte. I will tell you one of the matters that came up before the convention, and I will tell you how the business agent reported. A railroad is being built in Silver Bow County. The local took up the matter about whether they were going to be allowed to have a ten hour day in dealing with any of the employment agencies that do work in that county. The local appointed their business agent to look after it. He reported back to the convention like this: "I have made a contract." He made a contract, and they were going to draw up a letter under the seal of the union, stating that the day should be nine hours and the wage three dollars. Ordinary railroad work now is ten hours and \$2.50. Now, I suggested to the business agent after it was over—because I didn't want to take the floor of the local—that it would be contrary to our principles to shape up a letter of that kind in the language he did, because it would be construed in the nature of a contract, and that contracts are contrary to our principles. I suggested to him that he shape it as follows: That the day shall not be more than nine hours and the wages shall not be less than \$3. That would give the laboring men in that community an opportunity to bring the day down from nine to eight hours, without having any letter or contract; it would give them the power if they saw fit and had the power to raise wages from three to four dollars. The union stating it in that form it would be no contract, while if it stated it in the other form it would be a contract. Of course, we don't believe in contracts that would tie us up over night. It was so stated in the convention last year. In a great collective body every man cannot look after their business.

**DEL. DUNCAN:** A point of order. The subject of wages of organizers has been passed on and should not be considered here.

**DEL. PARKS:** I am not discussing the wages of organizers. I say where you have a thousand or two thousand men it seems to be necessary to have somebody to look after the collective business and report it back, but these fellows ought not to have any power to make any contracts or anything of that kind. That is the basis and the reason of our report here.

**THE CHAIRMAN:** Is there any objection to unanimous consent?

**DEL. COX:** Not that I want any remarks of mine recorded in this stenographic report, but I want to give the reasons for my local sending in this resolution, and that is that we had a three-crowned internal fight in the union in St. Louis. We have had the burden of this business agent proposition because of the action of a local union down

there in the Metal and Machinery Department that came and installed in last year's convention, carrying with it their business agent and continuing to conduct its business and affairs along the same old line, this business agent being connected with and a member of the Business Agents' League in St. Louis. That league's business or purpose was to keep up and perpetuate those business agents in office, to send out slugging committees, boycotting committees, connected with the A. F. of L. and all other forms of organization. Now, Charles G. Kirkpatrick, the president of the Metal and Machinery Department, came to St. Louis and sustained that organization and sustained the business agents in their attitude when the Industrial Council was fighting it. President C. O. Sherman in his communication to me addressed me as the business agent of the Industrial Council, and I protested against it and so did the council. In short, that is the reason for our local sending this resolution by me to this convention, and the desire of the local was to eliminate that term "business agent" and have the reflection upon us thereby eliminated, for the I. W. W. have no use for business agents in that kind of capacity.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any objections to granting unanimous consent to concurring in this motion?

DEL. TULLAR: I object.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any others? If not, the Chair will declare it carried. So ordered.

#### CHARGES AGAINST CHICAGO LOCALS.

DEL. PARKS (continuing report): Resolution E, presented by Bro. Shenkan, from Local No. 133, San Francisco, relating to Local 83, Chicago, and also to local 263, Chicago, alleging that especially Local 83 of Chicago is not organized in accordance with the principles of industrial unionism, and praying that the charters of said locals 83 and 263 be revoked, and recommending that restaurant employees be reorganized in order that there may be one charter covering all hotel and restaurant employees in Chicago and vicinity, in such branches as local conditions justify. The committee recommends that this be referred to the incoming general administration to investigate the charges alleged in this resolution, and if found to be true, to take such actions as are necessary to reorganize in accordance with the constitution already adopted by this convention.

(Unanimously concurred in.)

#### UNIFORM WAGE SCALES.

DEL. PARKS (report continued): Resolution No. 60, Local 222, Spokane, referred from Committee on Constitution, requesting the establishment of a uniform wage scale. The committee finds that Resolution No. 60 violates the principle of autonomy already adopted, and we further find that the question of wages should be reported upon by the Committee on Constitution. We therefore refer Resolution 60 back to said committee with a recommendation that the uniform compensation feature be not concurred in. I believe this resolution was acted on yesterday, and I therefore recommend that no action is necessary now.

(Unanimously concurred in.)

#### SALARY OF LOCAL SECRETARY.

DEL. PARKS (report continued): Resolution 52, from Local 202, Salt Lake City, referred from Committee on Constitution, regarding wages or salary of local secretary. The Committee recommends that

the matter of compensation of officers of locals be left to the local unions, provided that motions or rules establishing a wage or salary shall have been introduced and read at the previous regular meeting; provided further, that the rules setting the salary shall not become retroactive and must be passed on in a regular meeting. I will state briefly our reasons for making this last recommendation. When Local 222 of Spokane split and went to the independent organization, the last thing that the fakirs there did was to find out every man who had served in any way in an official capacity, or to find out if they had a salary or wage coming to them, and under that rule they voted every man a salary and depleted the treasury. That is the reason for our later recommendation.

(On motion unanimously concurred in.)

#### SICK AND DEATH BENEFIT FUND.

DEL. PARKS (continuing report): Resolution 17, from Local 50, St. Regius, Mont., referred from Committee on Constitution, recommending an amendment of Article III, Section 3, so as to provide that locals may appropriate a residue of the 25 cents local dues to a sick, accident and death benefit fund. The committee recommends that the resolution be not concurred in, as we find that providing and maintaining ambulances, hospitals, shrouds and other paraphernalia of the undertaking business are not among the aims, purposes and objects of the Industrial Union movement. The committee further recommends that wherever the workers may deem any benefit or insurance feature of any kind to be necessary or expedient, they may create or maintain such fund or institution wholly separate and apart from the I. W. W.

It was moved and seconded to adopt the committee's report.

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been regularly moved and seconded that the report of the committee be concurred in. Is there any objection to granting unanimous consent?

DEL. McKNIGHT: I object.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any further objections? The Chair hears none, and declares it carried.

#### LOWER DUES: ABOLITION OF PRESIDENT.

DEL. PARKS (report continued): Resolution 8, from Locals 61, 161, 284 and 38. Part 2, making request for less dues. The committee's action on Resolution No. 2 already disposes of the question; therefore it needs no action. The third part, relating to abolition of departmental president, the committee recommends that this question be left to the departments, provided, however, that this convention does not otherwise deal with the matter.

(Unanimously concurred in.)

#### PROXIES.

DEL. PARKS (report continued): Resolution 13, from Local 77, Goldfield, Nev., referred from Committee on Constitution, protesting against proxy votes in I. W. W. conventions. The committee recommends that this be concurred in, provided that it be not construed to prevent two or more local unions or branches with a membership of 500 or less from jointly sending a delegate to represent them.

(Unanimously concurred in.)

## DESIGNATION OF DEPARTMENTS.

DEL. PARKS (report continued): Resolution 16, from Local 240, Joplin, Mo., relating to sundry matters as follows: First, requesting that a department shall be known as a department of the I. W. W. and by no other name. Referred to the incoming general administration for consideration and recommendations.

(Unanimously concurred in.)

## CHARTERING LOCALS DIRECT.

DEL. PARKS (report continued): Section 2, same resolution, requesting that all local unions of departments be directly chartered from the national office and to pay dues to the national office. The committee finds that this conflicts with the constitution. We therefore do not make any recommendation. (No action taken.)

## REPRESENTATION IN CONVENTIONS.

DEL. PARKS (report continued): Part 3, same resolution, suggesting that local unions have in convention one vote for each 50 members. The committee finds that this is already provided for in the constitution, and requires no action.

Part 4, same resolution, that no delegate shall represent more than twelve locals or have more than twelve votes in the convention. Referred to Committee on Constitution. That has been already acted upon and disposed of.

## INITIATION FEE, DUES AND PER CAPITA TAX.

Resolution 20, from Local 307, relating to substitute for Paragraph 3, Section 3, Article III of the constitution, fixing the initiation fee at one dollar, half of which is to be applied on the first month's dues and the other half on the official organ for one year's subscription. The committee refers same to Committee on Constitution without recommendation. The convention's action on the report of the Committee on Education and Literature disposes of this question.

Resolution 24, from Local 162, Belleville, Ill., referring to department and local charter fees, department dues, local union per capita tax and strike benefits, all of which are practically embodied in the present rules of the I. W. W., and therefore needs no special notice or recommendation, and the same is referred to the Committee on Constitution without recommendation.

## CLOSING OF ACCOUNTS.

Resolution 6, by John Riordan, recommending that at the semi-annual closing of accounts an expert accountant be employed by the Local Executive Board to audit the books, and the auditor's report to be sent to all local unions and the General Executive Board. The committee concurs.

(Unanimously concurred in.)

## CONVENING GENERAL BOARD.

Part 2 of the same resolution, providing that local executive board, with the officers thereof, be empowered to convene the General Executive Board. The committee approves of the same.

(Unanimously concurred in.)



## REPORTS OF G. E. B. MEETINGS.

Part 3 of the same resolution, providing that a stenographic report of all meetings of the G. E. B. be taken and submitted to the convention of the I. W. W. We find that this has already been provided for by the previous action of this body, and therefore needs no further action.

## BONA FIDE WAGE WORKERS.

Resolution No. 1, from Local 86, Omaha, Neb., referred from Committee on Constitution. Part 3, relating to admission of bona fide wage workers has already been disposed of by the convention, needing no action.

## SUNDRY REFERENDUMS.

Part 7, Section 8, election of general officers by votes of rank and file. The committee recommends that the convention deal with this matter at the time set out in its regular order of business, which I am able to report has already been disposed of and needs no action.

Section B, providing that all laws and actions of the G. E. B. upon matters of general and national importance be referred to a referendum vote. The committee submits that if said laws and rules of the G. E. B. do not violate the principles of the Manifesto and Preamble or conflict with or override the constitution, a referendum vote on such actions of the G. E. B. would be an abuse of the referendum which would tend to bring it into ill repute. Further, that this does not in any way supersede the constitutional right to demand a referendum.

DEL. MOSKOWITZ: I move to concur. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded that the report of the committee on this matter be concurred in. Are there any objections to granting unanimous consent?

DEL. DUNCAN: I object.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any further objections?

DEL. FLASCHKAMP: I object.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any further objections? The Chair hears none, and the motion is declared carried.

## ITEMIZED ACCOUNTS.

DEL. PARKS (continuing report): Resolution 31, from Cincinnati Local, referred from Committee on Constitution, for action on Part 8 thereof, relating to quarterly itemized statement of expenses. Approved of and referred to the incoming general administration.

(Unanimously concurred in.)

## NAMES AND ADDRESSES OF SECRETARIES.

Part 9 of the same resolution, requesting that names and addresses of corresponding secretaries be sent out every three months. Referred to incoming general administration without recommendation.

(Unanimously concurred in.)

## REFERENDUM ON CONSTITUTION.

Part 10 of the same resolution, that the new constitution be not in force until the whole has been submitted to an ad seriatim referendum. Referred back to the Committee on Constitution, with recommendation that said committee be guided in providing for any general referendum by convention's actions on Resolution 1. Part 7, Section B.

## OPEN SHOP.

Part 11, same resolution, Section A. The unintelligent, indefinite and vague reference to open shop does not give the committee suf-

ficient ground for action. Therefore we are unable to report on that question.

THE CHAIRMAN: No action necessary.

DEL. MOSKOWITZ: I move to place it on file.

#### APPRENTICESHIP LIMITATION.

DEL. PARKS (continuing report): Section B, part 11 of same resolution, on limitation of apprenticeship. The committee concurs.  
(Unanimously concurred in.)

#### APPEALS FOR FUNDS.

Same resolution, Part 11, Section C, appeals for funds to go through the G. E. B. Concurred in unless otherwise ordered by the convention.  
Balance of 31 referred to Ritual Committee.

#### SPRING VALLEY RESOLUTION.

Resolution 62, Local 353, Spring Valley, Ill., Part 1, recommending abolition of office of General President and vesting the general executive powers in a General Executive Board. The committee finds that no action is now necessary.

Part 2 of the same resolution, relating to sending out organizers to organize in the coal regions. Referred to incoming general administration, with recommendation that they confer with the Mining Department upon the matter.

(Unanimously concurred in.)

#### POWER TO CALL LOCAL STRIKES.

Resolution 62, Part 3, dealing with the power of local unions to call strikes, giving such locals power to call strikes without any reference to the judgment of the G. E. B. The committee finds that this matter has been disposed of by the convention in its action on the report of the Committee on Strikes and Lockouts. The committee further recommends that any local violating these rules shall thereby forfeit its right to strike benefits.

(Unanimously concurred in.)

#### OUTLINE OF PROPOSED ORGANIZATION.

Resolution 4, from Locals 31, 26, 34, Schenectady, N. Y., being an outline of proposed shop and residential organizations, with active and vital questions such as out-of-work, sickness, strike benefits, and also detailed suggestions of organization. I will state that it is a three or four page typewritten article, but since it would take an hour to read it the same is referred to the incoming general administration for their edification, without recommendation.

(Unanimously concurred in.)

DEL. PARKS (reading additional report): Oct. 1, 1906, 8 P. M. Parks, Mullady and Moskowitz present. Petriella being absent on other business, and P. R. McDonald having served notice that he would serve no longer on the committee.

#### ORGANIZER FOR SILK WORKERS.

The first business taken up was Resolution N, from Locals 190, 176, 336 and 301, Silk Workers, New York City, requesting that an organizer familiar with the textile industry be placed in their field to explain the "cleaning up" done at this convention, and to build up unions representing the textile industry. Referred to the incoming administration.

(Unanimously concurred in.)

## RECOGNIZING CARDS.

Resolution from Local 199, I. W. W., referred from Committee on Constitution, recommending that the I. W. W. recognize cards from European organizations of working men. We concur with the request and refer the matter to the incoming administration.

(Unanimously concurred in.)

## ORGANIZING WORK.

Resolution B. from Local 7, Chicago, referred from Committee on Constitution, requesting that organizing work be done through or under the direction of the local or district council wherever possible. The committee finds that the right of local and district councils to employ organizers is in no way abridged, provided that said organizers adhere to the principles of industrial organization as laid down and defined by this convention. It needs no action.

## OUT-OF-WORK STAMP.

Resolution 19, from Belleville, Ill., Local 162, referred from Committee on Constitution, relating to (1st) that the I. W. W. adopt an "out-of-work" stamp. The committee does not concur in this, but it recommends instead the following: That in cases where members report themselves out of work because of sickness or long-continued depression, that the dues be remitted and that the financial secretary report same to the national or departmental headquarters.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection to granting unanimous consent to concurrence in this portion of the committee's report?

DEL. TULLAR: I think the sense of the committee is all right, but I don't like their actual disposition of the case. I believe while it would be necessary to have an out-of-work stamp, yet I think a legitimate excuse to a local financial secretary that a member is out of employment should be sufficient to exempt him from the month's dues in which he is out of employment, and the financial secretary should so report to the departmental or general office.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection to granting unanimous consent?

DEL. DUNCAN: I object to the report. I think it would be impracticable to establish a rule that all those that report themselves out of work should have their dues remitted, and we would cater to an element there that would probably not be deserving of assistance. The deserving element would not report, and the undeserving element would, and therefore I am against it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any further objections?

Delegates McKnight, Brown, Haver, Kleese and Shenkan objected.

DEL. PARKS: The committee asks for the floor to refer the matter to the General Executive Board for their consideration. We want to modify our report to that extent.

DEL. KLEESE: I move that that be accepted.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection to granting unanimous consent to concurrence with the committee's report on this matter? The Chair hears none, and declares it concurred in unanimously.

DEL. DUNCAN: Record me in the negative.

## AGREEMENTS WITH EMPLOYERS.

DEL. PARKS (continuing report): Same resolution, Part II, "Resolved, that no agreement be entered into by any local organization and their employers." The committee concurs in said resolution.

It was moved to concur.

DEL. SHENKAN: Already disposed of.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection to granting unanimous consent to this part of the committee's report?

DEL. PARKS: I am requested to make it plain that we mean a contract that would bind us up in the courts or anything of that kind. That is the sense of the resolution.

DEL. KLEESE: That is all right, but it says "contract."

DEL. PARKS: Yes, "contract"; that is what it means.

(Unanimously concurred in.)

#### SALARY OF G. E. B. MEMBERS.

DEL. PARKS (report continued): Resolution 7, Local 259, being a lengthy typewritten article of 29 parts, of which we have acted on Parts 5, 12, 13, 26 and 29, respectively, as follows:

No. 5, that all members of the G. E. B. shall receive a uniform salary of \$1,000 a year. The committee does not concur, but recommends that the convention set the per diem, if any, and provide for the payment of the expenses of the General Executive Board when they are called together.

(Unanimously concurred in.)

#### OFFICIAL JOURNAL.

Part 12, that all secretaries shall receive the official journal free. The committee does not concur.

(Unanimously concurred in.)

#### ONE GENERAL CONSTITUTION.

Part 13, that there shall be but one constitution for the entire organization, except by-laws not in conflict with the general constitution. Majority of the committee concurs in it, Reid and Moskowitz; Parks recommending that we non-concur. The minority report is that we non-concur. Now, you have two reports before you at once.

DEL. TULLAR: I move to accept the majority report. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded that the majority report be accepted.

DEL. PARKS: I will state the reasons for my non-concurring, I believe our constitution provides that the departments shall have a constitution of their own, provided that no part of that departmental constitution or local constitution shall in any way conflict with the general constitution, and I believe that the findings of the majority of the committee interfere with that autonomy as we have disposed of it and conflicts with the letter of the present constitution. That is the ground of my minority report. I had quite an argument with the committee.

DEL. SHENKAN: I move that the minority report be concurred in.

DEL. TULLAR: There is a motion already that the majority report of the committee be accepted.

DEL. PARKS: If you do not accept the majority you should accept the minority.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection to granting unanimous consent to concurrence in the majority report?

DEL. DUNCAN: I object. We have only heard one side yet.

DEL. MOSKOWITZ: I can't recommend it exactly. We had quite an argument. Now, Mr. President, I will explain the majority's stand on this proposition. We understand the spirit of this convention. The spirit of this convention shows that this organization of the I. W. W., whether it has any departments or none, shall be uniform as much

as possible. Now, you have seen the constitutions and by-laws of some of those departments, and you will find in a good many instances they conflict with the general organization, and the committee in this report have disagreed. They argued the question to some extent, and the majority of the committee came to the conclusion, understanding the spirit of this convention, that we must have a uniform organization to the best extent we possibly can. This is why they have taken this stand, and I ask this convention to concur in the majority report.

DEL. PARKS: I stand upon the same ground, that I believe the organization should be uniform, but I maintain that the provision in this constitution setting forth that these departmental constitutions shall in no way violate the principles and the letter of the law in the national constitution covers that point. The Western Federation of Miners has its constitution. What are constitutions? Well, in my opinion, call it by-laws or constitution or whatever you call it, it is one and the same thing, and it is a kind of squabble over names. We provide that the locals shall have local constitutions, and our constitution provides that the locals and departments shall submit their constitutions to the G. E. B. for consideration to see whether there is any conflict, and if there is, let them change them. If we adopt a constitution by referendum and there are conflicting clauses in our local constitution or department constitution they become inoperative.

DEL. TULLAR: I make a motion to adopt the majority report, and I would like the floor for a few minutes.

DEL. FOX: Second the motion.

DEL. TULLAR: My object in taking the floor in favor of the majority report is because upon one very material point one of our departments refutes the fundamental principle of industrial unionism, and that principle is that a certain department, in a constitution which I have in my pocket, recognizes a community of interest between employer and employee—a direct slap at the principle of industrial unionism. Hence I say that all constitutions should be uniform, with one constitution for all.

DEL. PETRIELLA: I would like to state that the constitution which Bro. Tullar has in his pocket is obsolete, as we have a new one since then; a new one which recognizes no identity of interest between employer and employees.

DEL. FRENCH: I move that this whole matter be referred to the incoming administration.

DEL. DUNCAN: I would like to have the majority report read again.

(The majority report was read.)

DEL. PARKS: The majority of the committee concurs. The minority does not. But I will say now that Bro. Petriella was absent, and he says he stands with me, so the committee stands divided, and it is a question for the house now to decide. There is no majority or no minority report, because it is just a balance.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is to concur in the report of the majority of the committee.

DEL. KLEESE: Unanimous.

DEL. MOSKOWITZ: I wish you would put that on the first part of the report of the committee.

DEL. RICHTER: That is all right. We understand what it means. Proceed to vote.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is to concur in the first part of the report of the committee, to concur in the spirit of the resolution acted on.

DEL. FRENCH: This whole situation as presented by both the majority and minority is not quite satisfactory to me, because my personal view of it is that we could permit departments and industrial unions to have constitutions approved by the General Executive Board so as not to have them conflict in any way with the general constitution. But I also do not believe it is necessary for every little body that is organized to get out a set of by-laws and call it a constitution. For that reason I move to refer the whole business to the general administration and let them thrash it out with the different bodies that want to get up rules and regulations for their bodies.

DEL. HESLEWOOD: I second the motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: A motion has been made and seconded that the whole matter be referred to the incoming administration. Are there any objections to granting unanimous consent?

DEL. KLEESE: Kleeese objects.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any further? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

#### SCHOOL FOR ORGANIZERS.

DEL. PARKS (continuing report): Part 26, that the headquarters shall establish a revolutionary school for organizers. Referred to Educational Committee.

#### EXPELLED MEMBERS.

Part 29, that names of all members expelled from the I. W. W. shall be published in the official journals. Committee concurs.

(Unanimously concurred in.)

DEL. FLASCHKAMP: I object.

#### PER CAPITA TAX.

DEL. PARKS (report continued): Resolution No. 6, from Local 8 of Metal and Machinery Department, Pullman, Ill., setting forth their opinion that the present per capita tax is too high, and therefore retards growth of membership in their organization, and requesting that the per capita tax be reduced from 25 cents to 10 cents. I will report that this question has been disposed of in accordance with our action, page 20 of this report, on Resolution No. 2, and needs no action.

#### NATIONAL ORGANIZERS IN CONVENTION.

Resolution from Local 169, Tacoma, Wash., Part 4, protesting against any national organizer representing any local in the national convention, or to represent by proxy. Committee does not concur, but recommends instead that any organizer of the I. W. W. may represent any local, providing he carries no more than five votes.

It was moved and seconded to concur.

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded that the report of the committee on this matter be concurred in. You have heard the motion.

DEL. DUNCAN: I am against this motion because I do not think that organizers ought to be permitted here at all. If you admit them even with five votes we are in danger of building up a machine within this organization similar to the A. F. of L. machines, and I think that ought to be very apparent to us all. I don't want to take the time of the convention further.

DEL. MOSKOWITZ: I wish to make it clear to the delegates why we reached this conclusion. An argument has been presented by different members that think with Bro. Duncan. Now, accordingly,

we came to the conclusion that we found ourselves in the same position as they do in reference to members of executive boards belonging to fraternal organizations, and we found that if we adopt the opinion of Bro. Duncan it will mean the following: that most of the active men and best men in the I. W. W. will be the organizers of this organization, and being thus the organizers of this organization, we will have to exclude the best men from this convention. Do you understand the point? It will be the case that probably Bro. Duncan himself will be out of this convention in the future. Now, the committee could not find any other way out of it, and consequently the committee came to the only conclusion, to limit their force, to limit them to five votes and no more. Then they will be barred from having that machine of which Bro. Duncan is so much scared.

DEL. PARKS: I will state one further reason that we considered in rejecting the position of Bro. Duncan. The argument of Bro. Duncan is based upon the assumption that the organizers are grafters. It is based upon the history and the observance of ordinary men in their experience with such organizations as the American Federation of Labor. The Chairman took the position that this organization was not pursuing the plans, tactics and principles of the A. F. of L. and such arguments would not hold.

DEL. RICHTER: I move to concur.

DEL. DUNCAN: Bro. President, I don't want to say much on this subject, but as the point has been raised so much in regard to me, I want to state that if our measures that we adopt here for the purpose of clearing this organization from the possibility of such machines as the A. F. of L. maintains necessitates my absence from this convention or any other convention, I will be only too glad to stay away. And further, I want to say as regards organizers being grafters, that there is nothing so very different between the humanity that gets into this organization and the humanity that has got into the A. F. of L.; that all men are subject to their material environments, and if you place the same conditions around the men in this organization you will develop the same character here that has been developed in the A. F. of L.

DEL. MOORE: I move that this part of the report be laid on the table. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded that this part of the committee's report be laid on the table. Are there any objections to granting unanimous consent to this motion?

Objection was expressed by delegates Parks, Kleese, Sims and Moskowitz.

DEL. PARKS: I call for a roll call on the proposition. We are dodging the question.

DEL. RICHTER: Sure.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any further objections?

DEL. RICHTER: I object.

DEL. JOHNSON: I object.

DEL. NORDHOLDT: I object.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any further objections?

DEL. RIORDAN: I object.

THE CHAIRMAN: Then you will have to call the roll, I guess.

A DELEGATE: What is the question?

DEL. PARKS: They want to lay this proposition on the table. I will read it again. They protest against national organizers representing any local in the national convention. Now, the committee

does not concur, but recommends instead that any organizer of the I. W. W. may represent any local, provided he carries no more than five votes. They propose to lay that on the table.

The roll was partly called.

DEL. HAVER: I would like to explain my vote. I would like to say that the reason why I vote to lay this on the table is because I feel, especially in a convention like this that has lasted three weeks, that organizers should be out doing work and not be sitting in the convention.

The ballot was finished and resulted: Total vote, 317; Yes, 239; No, 78.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion to table is carried.

### ORGANIZING IN LUMBER REGIONS.

DEL. PARKS (resuming report): Parts 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9 disposed of. Part 10, in reference to organizing the loggers in the lumber regions. Committee refers same to incoming administration for their special attention.

(Unanimously concurred in.)

### SICK AND DEATH BENEFIT.

Resolution 47, from Bingham Canyon, Utah, Local No. 93, by Del. Motherwell, asking that sick and death benefit fund be established. This subject has been disposed of in our action on Resolution 17, pages 31, 32 and 33 of this report, and needs no action.

The same resolution touches on other matters, such as label, constitution and uniform color of label, already disposed of.

Resolution 43, from Local No. 250, Part 1, asking that locals be permitted to provide sick and death benefits. Committee takes same action as on Resolutions 17 and 47.

Resolution 3, from Local 252, Parts 1, 2 and 3, disposed of.

On Sec. Trautmann's report, the committee takes the position that the matters therein referred to our committee have all been disposed of by the action of the convention in referring the same to the General Executive Board for reference, and need no action.

This concludes the report of your Organization Committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: If there is no objection the committee will be discharged.

DEL. DUNCAN: Before the committee is discharged I want to call attention to a little of the language that was used in referring to a resolution of mine, No. 60. You remember that the committee referred to it as a resolution in favor of the establishment of a uniform wage scale. Now, I want to correct the committee there, as the resolution contemplated or advised nothing of the kind. My resolution was for a wage scale as high as consistent with local conditions.

THE CHAIRMAN: Del. Duncan, if the Chair is correct, your resolution was referred to the Constitution Committee, and not to this committee at all.

DEL. DUNCAN: I was just correcting its language, to show that that language was misquoted and no such language was used in the resolution.

THE CHAIRMAN: The committee is discharged.



## REPORT OF RITUAL COMMITTEE.

The Committee on Rituals, through its chairman, Del. Fischer, presented the following report:

To the Second Annual Convention of the Industrial Workers of the World:

Mr. Chairman and Fellow Delegates: We, the undersigned, acting as your Committee on Rituals, received the following resolutions for consideration. Is it necessary to read them?

THE CHAIRMAN: No.

DEL. FISCHER (continuing report): We now take the liberty of submitting to you the following recommendations:

1. All rituals, signs, grips and passwords shall be abolished.

It was moved and seconded to concur in the report.

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded that the report of the committee in this matter be concurred in. You have heard the motion. Are there any objections to granting unanimous consent?

DEL. McKNIGHT: Record me as objecting.

DEL. PETRIELLA: I would like to ask a question. Does that resolution affect my department?

DEL. RICHTER: The entire organization will be affected.

DEL. FISCHER: Everything.

DEL. PETRIELLA: Then I wish to be recorded as voting in the negative.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any other delegates objecting? If not, the Chair will declare the motion carried. So ordered.

DEL. FISCHER (continuing report): 2. The presiding officer shall, before a new member is initiated, read to said member the preamble of the constitution and then ask him the following questions:

(a) Do you agree that the working class and the capitalist class have nothing in common?

(b) Do you realize that the working class, who produce all wealth, have nothing, and the capitalist class, who do not produce, have everything?

(c) Do you agree therefore that labor is entitled to all it produces?

(d) Do you realize that between these two classes a constant struggle is going on?

(e) Do you realize that this fight can only end when capitalism is abolished?

(f) Do you agree that the only way to accomplish this is by the industrial form of organization, which is in accordance with the present mode of production?

(g) Do you therefore pledge yourself as a co-worker to work and agitate for these principles and uphold the constitution and by-laws of the I. W. W.?

After answer in the affirmative the president will declare him a member of the I. W. W.

It was moved and seconded to adopt the report.

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded that this portion of the Committee on Ritual's report be adopted. Are there any objections to granting unanimous consent to concurrence in the same?

DEL. PINKERTON: I would like to ask a question. Supposing a candidate would say that he does not agree?

DEL. FISCHER: Then it is up to him.

DEL. PINKERTON: If he desires to become a member of the Industrial Workers of the World does that bar him?

DEL. FISCHER: The man has to wait till he advances so far that he can answer that question.

DEL. PINKERTON: I am asking the question of the committee, does that bar him from becoming a member?

DEL. FISCHER: It does not bar him from becoming a member.

DEL. PINKERTON: It does not bar him?

DEL. FISCHER: Only it bars him from becoming a member at that certain moment when he does not know how to answer the question. He will simply wait till he has educated himself to that extent that he knows.

DEL. PINKERTON: Then he cannot become a member of the Industrial Workers of the World?

DEL. FISCHER: If he don't agree to these propositions he cannot become a member.

DEL. PINKERTON: That is the question I asked to be answered. I object to these questions being asked because they pertain to political issues. The result is really going to bar out a great many men that don't understand these terms, at least the men I come in contact with when I am trying to draw them into this organization. If you go through with this ritual, then we are not going to have an organization anywhere in the vicinity where I live. We are not trying to teach men politics at all. We want to draw them first in the organization and educate them afterward. I am going to vote against any such questions being put to men, because 99 per cent know nothing about the class struggle at all, and we don't know whether they want to know. They come in for their material interest. We want them in first; the next thing is to educate them. If you are going to teach them more than the rudiments at first you will have nothing in there but radical socialists and S. L. P.'s. Let them be organized first and educated afterwards. You can't educate them on the street. I will have to vote against that because it is not along the right lines while we are trying to build the organization up.

DEL. DUNCAN: I am against this part of the committee's report, inasmuch if we adopt it we are bound to defeat the main object of this organization. The main object of a working class economic movement must be to conduct the wage workers' part of the class struggle as it is now and here. The capitalist class is bound to conduct its part of the struggle against us. If we do not meet them we will suffer, and in order to meet them we must maintain a militant wage scale. That I am against. We must make our demands and fight for them the best we can, and in order to do that we have got to have numbers. We have got to have the members of the working class. Every man that has a stomach must have a common cause with us. It don't matter whether he has a brain or not, as far as the purposes of this movement are concerned. We have a common cause with him in so far as he has a stomach, and we should draw none but stomach lines as far as the qualifications for membership go in this movement.

DEL. FRENCH: I don't want to say very much, except there isn't anybody more than myself who desires to see the membership of the I. W. W. fully imbued with the principles and with the knowledge of what we are driving at and of the need of us taking that attitude that would give us a chance to reach out and get those people and strive to imbue them with that knowledge. The policy we follow in New York generally and in the local which myself and Del. Kinneally belong to in particular, is that when we get a new member we have the presiding officer read to him the Preamble. We have ignored that

ritual that was used here pretty nearly altogether. We read to him the Preamble as a matter of instruction, and sometimes the presiding officer, or someone, will make a few remarks in addition to that, and in that way we proceed to strive to imbue him with the spirit and knowledge that goes with the organization. Therefore, I would move as a substitute for that recommendation of the committee, that upon the initiation of a member the presiding officer read to said candidate from the Preamble of the constitution as a matter of instruction, and thereupon declare him a member if he has been accepted by the local. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded as a substitute that the presiding officer read to each candidate the preamble of the constitution and thereupon declare him elected if he has been accepted by the members of the local previously.

DEL. RICHTER: I suggest that the mover of the substitute embody the last clause that he pledge himself to abide by the laws and principles of the organization.

DEL. FRENCH: I accept that.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: And that the applicant agree to become acquainted and make himself familiar with the principles of the I. W. W. as a form of organization.

DEL. FRENCH: That is all right. I am willing to accept that, that he ask him to agree to make himself acquainted or strive to make himself acquainted.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection to granting unanimous consent to the adoption of this substitute?

DEL. MOORE: I object.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any other objection? The Chair hears none, and it is declared adopted.

DEL. FISCHER (continuing Ritual report): No. 3. Any member elected to any office in the I. W. W. shall, upon entering on his functions, take the following pledge, which shall be read to him and subscribed by him: I regard it as a sacred duty of every laboring man, and especially of any one who is trusted by his fellow wage workers with a mission or position in the class struggle or wage war, to solemnly pledge my word and honor that I shall obey the constitution, rules and regulations of the I. W. W., and that, keeping always in view its fundamental principles and final aims, I shall to the best of my ability perform the task assigned to me. I believe in and understand the two sentences: The working class and the capitalist class have nothing in common; and Labor is entitled to all it produces.

It was moved to concur. Seconded.

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been regularly moved and seconded that this portion of the report of the Committee be concurred in.

DEL. DUNCAN: Record me in the negative.

DEL. KLEESE: I would like to amend by changing that term in there "capitalist class" to "employing class." Whether a man is a capitalist or a middle class man, he skins the worker just the same. That "capitalism" has got too much of a socialistic ring for some workers who are prejudiced.

DEL. DUNCAN: Is that amendment before the house?

THE CHAIRMAN: Which amendment?

DEL. DUNCAN: The amendment by Kleeese.

DEL. FISCHER: I accept it.

DEL. DUNCAN: Then I want to make an amendment that we change the wording of that so as to read that the working class and

the capitalist class have no common economic interest. It is not true that the working class and the capitalist class have nothing in common. We have a great many of the attributes of mankind in common. We are all men—

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate, if you make a motion don't make a speech.

DEL. DUNCAN: Am I not entitled to talk on my amendment? Isn't it open to debate?

THE CHAIRMAN: It is after your amendment has been seconded.

(Amendment seconded.)

DEL. DUNCAN: It is seconded over here.

THE CHAIRMAN: The amendment has been seconded. Are there any remarks?

DEL. FISCHER: The Committee holds that the working class and the capitalist class or employing class are all technical terms relating to the economic condition of the two classes, and understanding this, there is nothing in common between these two different interests.

DEL. HESLEWOOD: Is this one of the charges from one of the officers to a candidate?

DEL. FISCHER: No, it is a pledge.

DEL. HESLEWOOD: The pledge of an officer?

DEL. FISCHER: The pledge of an officer.

DEL. HESLEWOOD: That is different.

DEL. DUNCAN: If it is now in order I would like to state my reasons for wanting that changed as well in this as in the Preamble. We certainly are a part of the human race. I will recognize no philosophy that denies me a place in the human race, and I will recognize no philosophy that denies the working class a place in the human race. You may say that the working class and the capitalist class are merchandise. Marx says so; but Marx also says that the working class is living merchandise. Now, if we are a part of the human race we certainly have some things in common with every part of the human race. There are some things which we do not have in common, and on the lines of those things that we do not have in common our class divisions are drawn. We must come down to definition in order to understand this proposition. A class is composed of individuals. I do not care what it is a class of, a class of anything is made up of the individuals that compose it. And everything or anything which every individual belonging to a certain class possesses, that the whole class possesses. The qualities of every individual of a class are certainly the qualities of the class. I do not care what you take as an example.

DEL. COX: A point of order; not only that the delegate is out of order, but I take the position that I can produce an argument to refute his argument.

DEL. DUNCAN: Do it after I get through.

DEL. HESLEWOOD: No, we don't want that. We want to finish and go home.

DEL. DUNCAN: Every member of every class—

DEL. DE LEON: I rise to a point of order. It is that if this delegate is moving to change the action of this convention as to the language of the Preamble, such motion would be legitimate if he first moves to reconsider the action of this body in adopting the Preamble which holds the identical language which he has used. I desire a ruling.

DEL. DUNCAN: It is not in reference to the Preamble. It is merely in reference to the committee's report.

DEL. DE LEON: I desire a ruling on it.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair will rule that your point of order is well taken.

DEL. DUNCAN: I appeal from the decision of the Chair. It is not in reference to the Preamble at all.

DEL. RITCHER: It is the same words.

DEL. SHENKAN: There is no second to the appeal.

A DELEGATE: Seconded.

DEL. SHENKAN: I move to lay the appeal on the table. (Seconded by Augustine.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded that the appeal be laid on the table. Is there any objection to granting unanimous consent to this motion? The Chair hears none and it is so ordered. The Chair's ruling on Del. De Leon's point has also ruled the amendment out of order. The Chair now rules that the vote is on the obligation to the officer. Is there any objection to unanimous consent being granted to the adoption of this part of the committee's report?

Objection was heard from Delegates Flaschkamp, Moore and Duncan.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any more? The Chair hears none, and declares it carried.

DEL. FISCHER: (continuing report): No. 4. This pledge shall be printed in the Constitution.

(Unanimously adopted.)

DEL. FISCHER: This is the end of the document. Respectfully submitted,

EUGENE FISCHER,  
J. E. FITZGERALD,  
H. RICHTER,  
ALBERT SCHULZ,  
PAUL SCHWEINBURG.

THE CHAIRMAN: If there is no objection the Committee's report will be accepted and the Committee discharged. The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

DEL. RITCHER: There is another recommendation which the Committee has not reported, in regard to the application blank.

DEL. FISCHER: That is not here. It was not sent, and I have read the report here, and that is all that is here.

DEL. RITCHER: I beg leave to submit it now.

DEL. HESLEWOOD: I rise to a point of order. The Committee has been discharged.

DEL. RITCHER: I move that the question of application blanks be referred to the General Executive Board.

#### COMMITTEE ON GOOD AND WELFARE.

Del. Heslewood, chairman of the Committee on Good and Welfare, presented the following report:

DEL. HESLEWOOD: In regard to Resolution L, on the cigar makers' label, signed by Del. Lingenfelter, your committee recommends that the resolution be concurred in.

It was moved and seconded to concur.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection to granting unanimous consent to the adoption of the committee's report on this matter?

DEL. GOLDBERG: A point of information Is it only the blue label or all labels?

DEL. HESLEWOOD: It is only to recognize the red label of the I. W. W. and not to recognize the International Cigarmakers' label.

DEL. RITCHER: I move that the matter be laid on the table. (No second.)

Report unanimously adopted.

#### INSTRUCTIONS TO ORGANIZERS.

DEL. HESLEWOOD: These are the recommendations from the Good and Welfare Committee:

To the officers and delegates of the second annual convention, Industrial Workers of the World:

We, your committee, wish to report as follows:

First. We would recommend that the instructions to organizers be made so that no political party or its platform will be advocated by I. W. W. organizers while on the platform in the interests of the economic organization. I might say that it has been called to the attention of the committee that such things have been done in the past, and men have been teaching politics of one party or the other on the soap box while under the pay of the I. W. W.

DEL. COX: I move to concur in the report of the committee. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection to granting unanimous consent?

DEL. DE LEON: I move to amend by adding "and that the Executive Board be instructed not to appoint as an organizer of the I. W. W. any person who is acting as an organizer of any political party."

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection to the adoption of this amendment, the amendment stating that the Executive Board be instructed not to employ anyone as organizer of the I. W. W. who is an organizer for any political party?

DEL. RITCHER: Would that amendment be construed that he never can be an organizer for the I. W. W.?

THE CHAIRMAN: No.

DEL. RITCHER: We want to understand it.

DEL. DE LEON: It is very clear.

DEL. RITCHER: It may be very clear to you, but not to the rest of them.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: He would have to sever his connection as organizer in a political party in case he became organizer for the I. W. W.

(The report as amended was unanimously adopted.)

#### UNIVERSAL BUTTON.

DEL. HESLEWOOD: (report continued): Second. We would recommend that the universal button have stamped thereon the name of the department to which the wearer belongs; that is, the Mining department, &c., across the button.

It was moved and seconded to adopt the report.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any objections to adopting this portion of the committee's report?

DEL. DUNCAN: I object.

DEL. McCUE: I object.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any other objections? If not, the Chair will declare it carried. It is so ordered.

## DUE STAMPS.

DEL. HESLEWOOD (reporting): Third. We would recommend that all departments use the official I. W. W. stamp on all dues cards. The Mining Department at the present time is not using the official stamp of the Industrial Workers of the World.

It was moved and seconded to adopt the report.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any objections to the adoption of this motion to concur in the report on this matter?

DEL. FRENCH: I move to amend that the monthly due stamps after the present supply is out shall read "monthly dues stamp" instead of "25 cents." (Seconded.)

(Unanimously adopted.)

## LOCAL PRESIDING OFFICERS.

DEL. HESLEWOOD (continuing report): Fourth. We would recommend that the office of president be abolished in all local unions, and that each meeting elect its own chairman, the meeting to be called to order by the secretary. (Applause.)

It was moved and seconded to concur.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have heard this motion. Are there any objections to granting unanimous consent to concurrence?

Delegates Flaschkamp, McKnight, Kleese and Lingenfelter objected.

DEL. KLEESE: I would like to talk to that motion.

DEL. PARKS: I believe that is a matter that might be left at the present time to the local unions to decide. That is my idea.

DEL. FRENCH: The point is that we but advise following that procedure.

DEL. HESLEWOOD: We are perfectly willing to put anything in here that you want to make it complete.

The motion to concur was unanimously adopted.

## POLITICAL DISCUSSIONS IN LOCALS.

DEL. HESLEWOOD (reporting): Fifth. We would recommend that under the head of Good and Welfare in local unions at least ten minutes be given to the discussion of economic and political questions at each meeting. I might say that that is in force now in the Western Federation of Miners.

It was moved and seconded to concur.

DEL. SHENKAN: I move to make it half an hour.

DEL. HESLEWOOD: It is at least ten minutes. You can make it an hour if you want to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection to granting unanimous consent to concurrence in this part of the committee's report? If not, it will be declared carried. Rearing none, it is so ordered.

## REASONS FOR REMOVING OFFICIALS.

DEL. HESLEWOOD (continuing report): Sixth. We would recommend that a pamphlet be issued to the membership at once, setting forth the reasons for deposing the President and other officials on the Executive Board.

It was moved and seconded to concur.

(Unanimously carried.)

## CONCURRENCE IN PREAMBLE.

Seventh. We would recommend that all officers of the I. W. W., whether delegates to the convention, officers of local unions or de-

partments or members of the General Executive Board, shall, before being elected by their constituents, place themselves clearly on record as being in full accord with the Preamble of the Industrial Workers of the World.

It was moved and seconded to adopt the report.

DEL. MOORE: I object. That is a majority report of the committee. I wish to have time to state my reasons. I contend that the way that reads there, that Petriella, Goss, Mullady, Plummer and any man here who voted for changing the second clause in the Preamble could not be a delegate to the next convention. If that should read "the spirit of the Preamble," there would be no objection. But to make it obligatory to believe in the Preamble as it has been interpreted on the floor of this convention, that would bar them from the floor of the next convention. Now, you are going to bar a man who wants to go with you on the economic field but does not agree with you on the political. You want to bar him and will bar him on that proposition. You will not bar him from office, but you will bar him from being a delegate to the convention. That is the language there, and you can't quibble around it.

DEL. HAVER: I wish Bro. Heslewood would read a little slower. We can hardly understand you.

(The report was again read.)

DEL. DUNCAN: I want to make an amendment that we insert the word "spirit" before the word "preamble;" as being in full accord with the spirit.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any objections to unanimous consent to concurrence in this committee's report?

DEL. DUNCAN: I move an amendment that we insert the word "spirit" before the "preamble." (Seconded.). I am not in full accord with the Preamble as it is worded now, and I claim that I am just as much and as good an Industrial Worker as any man.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair will rule you out of order when you attempt to give a motion a latitude of that sort.

DEL. PARKS: At the Denver convention, as related to me, the men after they had been elected delegates representing the Mining Department to this convention, got up and said they stood on the Preamble. I was told that had McMullen made the talk before he was elected that he made after he was elected on the Preamble, McMullen would never have been sent to this convention, and he suggested that it be put in the order of business so that the rank and file should know, and I think it is a good reason.

DEL. McINTOSH: I object, and ask for the time of the convention to state my reasons for objecting. I think with the spirit of the Preamble I am in full accord, but with the wording of the first two paragraphs of the Preamble I am not in accord. I think I understand it, I believe that I do, as it is worded. But I want to say that to the average working man it is different. The average working man is not a scholar. The average working man is not a student. And the average working man, when you present the first two paragraphs of this Preamble, they are absolutely meaningless to him, and it takes a half hour to explain to him what they mean. Now, I maintain that in the first place the second paragraph of the Preamble contradicts the first clause of the first paragraph when presented to the average working man. Let us read it and see. We say, to begin with, that "the working class and the capitalist class have nothing in common." Then we go down here and we tell the average working man that the working class must come together on the political



field. Now, what does that mean to the average working man? It means simply going to a ballot box that is absolutely controlled by the capitalist class and depositing a piece of paper in it. That is what it means to him. And if that be true, then we are using that ballot box and we have that ballot box in common with the capitalist class. Now, I do not believe that the average working man understands the second paragraph of this Preamble. In fact, I know he don't. To him it is contradictory. "Between these two classes a struggle must go on until all the toilers come together." I want to say right here that it is almost an impossibility for all the toilers to come together. It is not necessary for all the toilers to come together in order for us to get what we are after. It is only necessary for a sufficient majority of us to come together or to be big enough and strong enough to take and hold these things.

(An interruption by Del. Schweinburg.)

DEL. McINTOSH: Delegate Schweinburg, I have never interrupted you when you were on this floor. I don't think I have ever interrupted any other delegate upon this floor, and I claim the right to speak upon this floor. I think I have as many rights on this floor as any other delegate here. "Until all the toilers come together on the political as well as on the industrial field, and take and hold that which they produce by their labor through an economic organization of the working class without affiliation with any political party." I say that is absolutely meaningless to the average working man. You tell him to come together on the political field, and what does he understand by coming together on the political field but the use of that mystic ballot box that has been held up to him as something by which he might gain his emancipation? We know, every one of us knows, that it is absolutely impossible that there is any emancipation that is going to come through that ballot box; that there is no power but economic power; that political power is only the reflection or expression of the economic power. Now, I believe that the ballot that we should take is the ballot inside of our own organization, and when we have learned our strength by taking that ballot inside of our own organization, when we discover that we are big enough to take and hold the industries, we do not need, as some would say, to capture the capitalist state and take it over and make a law to take these things. When we have pulled the foundation from under the capitalist state it will fall of itself; we do not need to capture it. Therefore, I am going to say that I object to this as it is worded. I think I am in accord with the spirit of the Preamble, but I am not in accord with the wording of it.

DEL. TULLAR: For the very reason that the delegate here says that the average working man does not understand that Preamble, for that very reason I would support the recommendation of that committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any objections to granting unanimous consent?

DEL. DUNCAN: I object.

DEL. MOORE: Haven't we been talking to the amendment? Isn't it the amendment that the brother has made there?

DEL. DUNCAN: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair ruled you out of order.

DEL. DUNCAN: You rule me out of order, and rule me out of the organization at the same time with that proposition.

THE CHAIRMAN: Not as the Chair understands it.

DEL. DUNCAN: That is what you have done.

A DELEGATE: You ruled yourself out the other day.

DEL. DUNCAN: You rule me out of order and you rule me out of the organization.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any other objections? If not, the Chair will declare it carried.

DEL. McINTOSH: I wish to be recorded as voting in the negative.

#### LOCAL PER CAPITA.

DEL. HESLEWOOD (continuing report): The next point is in regard to per capita tax of locals, which has been covered heretofore, and I don't see any use in bringing it up.

(The section referred to was as follows: "8. We recommend that mixed locals be given the same rights and privileges as regards per capita tax as departments paying  $8\frac{1}{3}$  cents per member per month, with no initiation fee attached.")

DEL. MOORE: Before this committee goes on I wish to state in the record, to go in the stenographic report, that under your decision I have been ruled out of this convention and ruled out of the organization.

#### OFFICIAL SEALS.

DEL. HESLEWOOD (report continued): "Ninth. We would recommend that in the future rubber stamps be issued to all local unions with their charter outfit instead of steel presses and seals as heretofore. The steel press seals cost in the neighborhood of \$2.50 each, and many of them get broken. Rubber stamps can be provided at a cost of 25 cents each, answering the purpose as well as the more expensive seal. The saving to our organization would amount to thousands of dollars annually, which money can be used to better advantage to our organization in the work of organizing and for literature."

(On motion, unanimously concurred in.)

#### OUTRAGES IN RUSSIA AND THE SOUTH.

DEL. HESLEWOOD (report continued): "Tenth. We would recommend that this convention of the Industrial Workers of the World place itself on record as most emphatically protesting against the brutal outrages and murders committed on our class, the negro wage earners of the south; and that suitable resolutions be drafted protesting against the outrages perpetrated upon our comrades by the ruling class of Russia."

(On motion, unanimously concurred in.)

#### READING THE PREAMBLE.

DEL. HESLEWOOD: I believe this last clause that we have has been passed: "We recommend that it be the duty of all secretaries of local unions to read the Preamble of our Constitution on opening the meeting at all locals.

Respectfully submitted,

T. W. HESLEWOOD,  
R. T. SIMS,  
GEORGE S. HOLMES,  
FRED G. MOORE."

THE CHAIRMAN: If there is no objection the committee will be discharged.

DEL. HOLMES: I believe Delegate Moore wishes to be recorded as objecting.

**THE CHAIRMAN:** If there is no objection the committee will be discharged. It is so ordered. This convention will stand adjourned till 1:15 P. M.

Adjourned until 1:15 P. M.

### AFTERNOON SESSION—OCT. 3.

Chairman St. John called the convention to order at 1:15 P. M.

**THE CHAIRMAN:** Report of the Auditing Committee.

### DEL. SIMS—PERSONAL MATTER.

**DEL. SIMS:** I want to ask a question of special privilege just for a moment before the report of the Auditing Committee comes in. I have here a couple of communications to read.

**THE CHAIRMAN:** All right.

**DEL. SIMS:** This is in connection with the action that was taken this morning by the convention that a circular should be sent out by the General Executive Board defining our action. I have a couple of communications here that I believe it would be well to embody in this communication which will be sent out to the rank and file. Hence, with your permission I shall read them. It is in the nature of a report made by myself. This is my report that I made to the General President of this organization.

**A DELEGATE:** "Ex-president."

**DEL. SIMS:** Ex-president of this organization on my last trip to St. Louis on an organizing trip.

(Del. Sims then read the following letter):

St. Louis, May 1, 1906.

Mr. C. O. Sherman, Gen. Pres.

Dear Comrade and Fellow Worker: In submitting my report of the past week I can say there are many things which in my judgment should have your immediate attention in this city and its immediate vicinity. East St. Louis, Granite City, Newport and Brookline I have visited and thereby secured some valuable information that I hardly think any one of the white organizers could have been successful in securing. I have found the ground thoroughly broken here in the fact that the comrades in the above mentioned places have worked hard and earnest in making propaganda for the I. W. W., even in the face of a strong opposition, even coming from some who heretofore professed to be militant unionists and through that profession were able to secure official recognition to the extent of being appointed organizers, official mouthpiece for the organization. I have reference to one Runge, whom I have found out to my satisfaction to be one of the greatest clogs in the wheel of I. W. W. progress. I firmly believe that your confidence has been abused in this matter, and hence recommend that you investigate further, and firmly believe the local which I have found to be equally as guilty as he in practicing "pure and simplicity" is the local that he is business agent for, and I did not think that there was room for business agents in the I. W. W., when we consider that in its true light it is a parasitic office made expressly for a go-between of the slave and his master. I find that we have nothing in common with our masters, and why a business agent? I further find that the Negroes who are in this locality are thoroughly organized in a Farley strike breaking organization with such perfection that no white man need to attempt to organize them along any other lines. Hence I think and know that my services are far more valuable to the I. W. W. in this and neighboring towns than anywhere I know of.

Faternally submitted,

R. T. SIMS, Organizer.

DEL. SIMS: That was submitted to Sherman on the first day of May. His reply to me on May 9th, after I returned to Milwaukee, reads as follows:

(Del Sims read the following letter:)

Chicago, Ill., May 9, 1906.

R. T. Sims, 363 Milwaukee St.,  
Milwaukee, Wjs.

Dear Sir and Fellow Worker:

I have been home for only three days and leave for the west this evening. In looking over the reports of our organizers of work done I learn that we have got to make some changes in order to make a showing such as will be expected at our annual convention, and I have decided that the work at Milwaukee is by no means progressing as it should, and, owing to the fact that there is such a crusade against our movement in your city, I have decided to cut off the expense and only maintain such organizers who are organizers in localities where good results are being obtained; hence, I am obliged to say to you that you had better look for other employment, as I will have to discontinue your services after May 26, 1906.

I desire, however, that you understand that we have no fault to find with your efforts, and I believe you have done all that any one could do under the circumstances, but the obstacles are so great that I believe it is going to require some time for sentiment to change in Milwaukee. Should I need your services in the future, I will be more than pleased to give you employment.

Thanking you very kindly for every effort made, I am, with best wishes,

Fraternally yours,

CHAS. O. SHERMAN.  
General President, I. W. W.

DEL. PARKS: Mr. Chairman—

DEL. SIMS: I move you, Mr. Chairman—

DEL. PARKS: I have got the floor.

DEL. SIMS: No, I have got the floor. I move that these two letters be embodied in the circular which the General Executive Board is instructed to send out to the rank and file; that they may be able to read these two letters and communications to show the connection that is formed between Sherman and the reactionaries. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: If there is no objection the letters will be so used.

DEL. PARKS: It should be referred to the General Executive Board for their information, and not that those will be embodied. It will make too much of a letter, too much of a document. He is not the only man that has been sacrificed that way.

DEL. BROWN: I object. It is a personal matter.

DEL. SIMS: It is not a personal matter.

DEL. BROWN: He wants to show the hostility of President Sherman to our organizers, to show the attitude that he held to the capitalistic class.

#### FITZGERALD VS. FOOTE.

DEL. FITZGERALD: I rise to a question of personal privilege. In the noise of the convention this morning when it was opened there was a communication read from Delegate Foote in regard to me and the action taken yesterday afternoon, and I would like to hear that communication read so that I may have a chance to go on record as stating what I did yesterday in regard to that communication.

**THE CHAIRMAN:** There was no action taken on the communication. I did not hear the communication mention you in any particular.

**DEL. TULLAR:** There are about twenty such cases right on the floor in the convention. We don't need any action. There are about twenty such cases.

**DEL. FITZGERALD:** I would ask that the communication be stricken from the stenographic report. This business has gone for enough. Let them stand on their own bottom, as I stated on the floor yesterday.

#### REPORT OF AUDITING COMMITTEE.

**DEL. FOX:** I want to state that in the pamphlet of accounts that have been circulated around among the convention there is a typographical error. Of course we do not notice typographical errors in the printed reports. Our record shows that Sims is credited with having received \$80.00. There is no such account on the books. It is a typographical error; it should be \$30. The books show \$30. This is the account, so that it is simply a typographical error.

(Del. Fox then read the following report of the Auditing Committee:)

#### INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD.

October 3, 1906.

Fellow Workers of the Convention:

Your Auditing Committee has worked long and faithfully under some disadvantages. Two members of the Committee, Emmanuel Hauck and B. S. Stone, were forced to go home, and a third, John McMullen, refused to serve, declaring that life was too short to give his Sundays and evenings to the work that devolved upon us—at the same time he was continually demanding that the Convention report upon the state of our finances.

The place of one of the absentees was filled by the Chairman of the Convention, who appointed James Rugg, so that the Committee was enabled to proceed with a working force of three.

We adopted the following order of business:

First. General review of accounts.

Second. Disbursements.

- A. Strike outlays.
- B. Expense collecting Moyer and Haywood fund.
- C. Bills for printing.

Third. Expenditures of General Offices.

- A. Sherman's expenses.
- B. Trautmann's expenses.
- C. General Executive Board's expenses.
- D. Organizers' expenses.

This task was comprehensive and required time and money. We have done our best, and submit our report.

We are convinced that the two expert bookkeepers, employed by the General Executive Board, who brought order in the accounts up to August 22, 1906, did their work perfectly, and we make their statement a part of our report.

## SECOND CONVENTION PROCEEDINGS

Sept. 13, 1906.

Messrs. F. McCabe and C. G. Kirkpatrick,  
Committee Executive Board,  
Industrial Workers of the World,  
Chicago, Ill.

Gentlemen:—

By your direction we have audited the books of account of the "Industrial Workers of the World" and the "Industrial Worker" for the period from July 25th, 1905, to July 31st, 1906, and have compiled therefrom the following statements:

### "INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD."

- Exhibit "A"—Bank reconciliation 8/22/1906.  
" "B"—Schedule of unpaid checks 8/22/1906.  
" "C"—Cash on hand 8/22/1906.  
" "D"—Cash reconciliation 8/22/1906.  
" "E"—Exchanges debited by Prairie State Bank and also paid by check to Secretary-Treasurer or which are unaccounted for.  
" "F"—Schedule of errors and differences 8/22/1906.  
" "G"—Statement of Secretary-Treasurer 8/22/1906.  
" "H"—Debits made by Prairie State Bank for which there are no checks or check stubs.  
" "I"—Schedule of missing checks 8/22/1906 (debited by bank).

### "INDUSTRIAL WORKER."

- " "J"—Bank and cash reconciliation 8/22/1906.  
" "K"—Debits made by Prairie State Bank, for which there are no checks or check stubs.

The result of this audit is that, providing all vouchers to be authentic, "Exhibit 'G'"—statement of Secretary-Treasurer, shows a total shortage of \$19.86.

In the examination of the accounts we find: (L) No vouchers upon which payments have been made by the Secretary-Treasurer bear the personal signature of the General President. In some instances, however, such vouchers have a signature of the General President stamped thereon, but such stamp signature has, it is understood, been in the possession of the Secretary-Treasurer. It may be said, therefore, that none of the vouchers produced have been authorized as contemplated by the Constitution. It is claimed that by reason of frequent absences of the General President, caused by the duties of his office, it is impracticable for him to personally sign all vouchers. But, if such is the case, provision should be made for the approval of all vouchers by some other official or some person on behalf of the General President.

(2) Countersignatures of checks by the General President were made on checks in advance of the use of checks, thus requiring only the signature of the Secretary-Treasurer for payment. The recommendation made in the case of vouchers will apply to the signature of checks.

(3) Several check stubs are marked "void" or "cancelled" and checks at the end of the check books are missing. All checks spoiled or cancelled should be preserved and made a part of the record.

(4) The account kept at the Prairie State Bank has never been balanced.

## SUGGESTIONS.

(A) That the funds: Journal and General be kept in one set of books. This may be done by providing columns in the General Cash Book and opening accounts with each in the General Ledger. By carrying out this system, the accounts would at all times show the true condition of each. At present these are confused.

(B) Payments be made only upon vouchers bearing the personal signature of the General President, or in the case of his absence, by some other official or some person in behalf of the General President. In the case of cash payments, receipts be taken for each, attached to one voucher and approved by the proper officer.

(C) A form of receipt be used, sample of which we hand you herewith. By using this form, the original is given to the payer, duplicate is retained in the record book, thus avoiding the possibility of an error in filling in the stub, and also saving extra labor.

(D) Payments be made in full or up to a certain balancing point. We note that this has not been done, especially so in the case of the Fraternal Supply Co. and the Joliet Printing Co.

(E) No checks be drawn on the general funds of the organization by any person away from the office. This will avoid confusion of the bank account as kept in the General Offices.

(F) The books be brought into balance and a trial balance sheet be drawn up at the end of each month.

(G) The books of account be audited periodically.

The above is respectfully submitted,

THE AMERICAN ACCOUNTING CO.,

Per C. G. Phillips, President.

G. W. Fleetwood, Auditor.

## INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD.

## EXHIBIT "A."

Bank Reconciliation August 22d, 1906.

Balance per bank statement, August 22, 1906.....	\$4,080.89
Unpaid checks, August 22, 1906, (Exhibit "B").....	524.97

Actual balance August 22, 1906 .....	\$3,555.92
--------------------------------------	------------

## EXHIBIT "B."

Number.	Schedule of Unpaid Checks.	Amount.
1094 .....		\$ 11.70
1114 .....		50.00
1116 .....		2.00
1117 .....		22.40
1118 .....		24.50
1122 .....		200.00
1125 .....		22.47
1126 .....		21.90
1127 .....		30.00
1128 .....		50.00
1130 .....		8.00
1131 .....		5.00
1132 .....		14.00
1133 .....		14.00
1138 .....		19.00
1139 .....		20.00
1140 .....		10.00
Total .....		\$524.97

## INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD.

## EXHIBIT "C."

Statement of cash in hand August 22d, 1906:

Express and money orders .....	\$31.00
Stamps .....	3.68
Tickets .....	24.75
Cash in drawer .....	7.51
Total .....	<u>\$66.94</u>

## EXHIBIT "D."

Cash reconciliation, August 22d, 1906:

Balance August 1, 1906, per cash book.....	\$ 2,705.37	
Balance August 1, 1906, per M. & H. Defense Fund cash book.....	221.70	
Receipts, General Fund, August 1 to 22, 1906.....	7,084.38	
Receipts, Defense Fund, August 1 to 22, 1906.....	232.80	
		<u>\$10,244.25</u>
Disbursements, checks drawn August 1 to 22, 1906.....	\$6,557.98	
Disbursements, cash vouchers, August 1 to 22, 1906.....	31.69	6,589.67
		<u>\$3,654.58</u>
Bank balance August 22, 1906 (Exhibit "A").....	\$3,555.92	
Cash drawer, August 22, 1906 (Exhibit "C").....	66.94	3,622.86
		<u>\$ 31.72</u>
Shortage .....		\$ 31.72

## INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD.

## EXHIBIT "E."

Statement of exchanges debited by Prairie State Bank and also paid by check to Secretary-Treasurer, or which are unaccounted for:

	Debit.	Credit.
November 29, 1905.....		\$2.50
December 30, 1905.....		3.00
January 30, 1906.....	\$3.50	
February 27, 1906.....	2.30	
March 31, 1906.....	4.30	
April 30, 1906.....	7.20	
May 28th, 1906.....	2.40	
June 30, 1906.....	3.35	
Industrial Worker:—		
March 31, 1906.....	1.45	
April 30, 1906.....	1.25	
May and June, 1906.....	1.30	
		<u>\$27.05</u>
		<u>\$5.50</u>
		5.50
Debit balance .....	\$21.55	

## EXHIBIT "F."

Schedule of errors and differences August 22, 1906:

No. 196, entered \$60.35 in cash book should be \$60.00.....	\$ .35	....
No. 131, entered in cash book \$15.40, should be \$15.14.....	.26	....
No. 100, entered in cash book 78c, should be 72c.....	.06	....



Voucher	Debit.	Credit.
No. 801, entered in cash book \$16.10, should be \$16.00.....	.10	....
No. 217, paid to Oliver Typewriter Co., not entered in cash book .....		\$ 5.00
No. 189, entered in cash book \$111.00 should be \$111.55.....	.55	
No. 191, entered in cash book \$4.00, should be \$4.01.....	.01	
No. 798, entered in cash book \$163.16, should be \$173.16.....	10.00	
No. 114, entered in cash book \$4.00, should be \$4.30.....	.30	
Checks Nos. 739-798-810, total \$123.00, voucher is for \$125. ....	2.00	
	<u>.77</u>	<u>\$17.86</u>
		.77

Credit balance .....\$17.09

Voucher No. 129, amount \$20.00, charged to mileage, should be salary.

Voucher No. 152, amount \$10.00, charged to miscellaneous, should be salary.

Voucher No. 734, April 14, 1906, charged to mileage, should be salary.

Voucher No. 130, October 19, 1906, loan of \$200.00 to Cleveland strikers, no repayment of same.

Voucher No. 506, Dan'l McDonald, \$79.25, paid under protest.

Voucher No. 600, amount \$42.10, check No. 558, drawn March 8, 1906, \$40.00, not entered in cash book until March 26, 1906.

Check No. 1078, entered in cash book in July, check not drawn until August 2, 1906.

Receipt No. 3375, March 1, 1906, is blank; states given to Fraternal Supply Co. for January and February accounts.

Receipt No. 1, missing March 21, 1906.

Receipt No. 96, missing.

Receipt No. 480, missing.

#### EXHIBIT "G."

Statement of Secretary-Treasurer August 22, 1906:

	Debit.	Credit.
Cash reconciliation, August 22, 1906, (Exhibit "D").....	\$31.73	....
Exchange statement, August 22, 1906, (Exhibit "E").....	21.55	....
"Industrial Worker," cash reconciliation, August 22, 1906. ....		\$ 9.24
Errors and differences, August 22, 1906, (Exhibit "F").....		17.09
	<u>\$53.27</u>	<u>\$26.33</u>
	26.33	
Deficit .....	<u>\$26.94</u>	
Less credit Exhibit "H"—worthless checks.....	7.00	
	<u>\$19.94</u>	
Less credit Exhibit "K"—difference between debit and amount of check .....	.08	
Net deficit .....	<u>\$19.86</u>	

#### EXHIBIT "H."

Debits Made by Prairie State Bank from 7/25/1906 to 8/22/1906 for Which There Are No Checks or Check Stubs.

## SECOND CONVENTION PROCEEDINGS

Date.	Amount.	Remarks.
9/15/1906	\$ 8.75	Checks drawn to Secretary-Treasurer to reimburse
9/26/1906	24.40	him for disbursements made account of the Industrial Worker of the World.
12/ 8/1906	10.60	Check to Stogie Workers—check not returned.
1/18/1906	5.50	Debit for worthless check—check re-deposited.
1/31/1906	30.00	Debit for worthless check—check re-deposited.
3/ 8/1906	17.00	Unable to locate.
4/12/1906	29.50	Unable to locate.
12/26/1906	5.00	Check returned—re-deposited. CR. Sec.-Treas.
7/13/1906	2.00	Check returned—re-deposited. CR. Sec. Treas.

## EXHIBIT "I."

## Schedule of Missing Checks 8/22/1906. (Debited by Bank.)

Date.	Number.	Name.	Amount.
11/1/1905	136	W. E. Trautmann	\$60.00

## EXHIBIT "J."

## Bank and Cash Reconciliation 8/22/1906.

Balance per Bank Book 8/22/1906.....	\$300.65
Unpaid checks—	
No. 101 .....	\$10.00
No. 102 .....	20.00
No. 103 .....	7.55
No. 104 .....	18.44
No. 106 .....	20.00
	<u>75.99</u>
Actual cash balance 8/22/1906.....	224.66
Cash in drawer 8/22/1906.....	25.01
	<u>249.67</u>
Cash voucher unentered.....	.50
	<u>250.17</u>
Bank and cash balance 8/22/1906.....	\$250.17
Balance per cash book 8/1/1906.....	\$381.81
Receipts 8/1-22/1906 .....	168.01
	<u>549.82</u>
Disbursements 8/1-22/1906 .....	308.89
	<u>240.93</u>
Overage .....	\$ 9.24

## EXHIBIT "K."

## "Industrial Worker."

Debts Made by Prairie State Bank for Which There Are No Checks or Check Stubs.

Date.	Amount.	Remarks.
3/14/1906	\$5.56	Foreign remittance—returned worthless—should be for \$5.48.
7/30/1906	1.00	Charged back by bank—worthless.

THE AMERICAN ACCOUNTING COMPANY.

(Incorporated 1894.)

Suite 1409 Tribune Bldg.,  
Telephone Central 597. Chicago.

## AS TO STRIKE OUTLAYS.

As to strike outlays, we have expended from General Headquarters, in addition to voluntary contributions, the sum of \$8,910.00. Of this amount \$815.00 is owed to individuals in Cleveland on note issued by the General Secretary-Treasurer. The Convention has already voted to pay this sum. The list of strike payments follows.

## GENERAL STRIKE FUND.

## Specified.

Dec. 28, 1906, Pittsburg Tobacco Workers .....	\$ 150.00
Feb. 8, 1906, Western Federation of Miners.....	3,000.00
Feb. 27, 1906, Western Federation of Miners.....	1,125.00
Mar. 16, 1906, Buffalo Garment Workers' strike relief.....	470.00
Apr. 27, 1906, Hartford Store Workers.....	60.00
May 11, 1906, W. Shurtleff, for strike relief, Hartford, Conn..	50.00
May 12, 1906, J. Schlessman, Youngstown strike.....	200.00
May 15, 1906, J. Kahr, Paterson Silk Workers.....	200.00
May 16, 1906, E. R. Markley, Youngstown strike.....	300.00
May 23, 1906, Youngstown, Ohio, strike relief.....	200.00
May 23, 1906, Paterson Silk Workers.....	200.00
June 4, 1906, W. Shurtleff, Hartford and New Haven.....	100.00
June 4, 1906, J. Kahr, Paterson strike relief.....	150.00
June 4, 1906, A. C. Ray, Youngstown strike relief.....	200.00
June 11, 1906, W. Shurtleff, New Haven strike.....	50.00
June 14, 1906, J. Meaney, New Haven Paper Makers.....	50.00
June 18, 1906, Robt. Roadhouse, Youngstown strike.....	100.00
June 21, 1906, J. Kahr, Paterson Silk Workers.....	120.00
June 21, 1906, W. H. Goebeler, New York Silk Workers.....	200.00
June 23, 1906, W. Shurtleff, New Haven and Hartford strike..	50.00
June 28, 1906, J. Kahr, Paterson Silk Workers' strike.....	150.00
July 6, 1906, Strike relief to No. 176, New York Silk Workers	150.00
July 6, 1906, Alfred Huettner, Glendale Silk Workers.....	150.00
July 17, 1906, Metal Dept. strike relief for 3 men.....	15.00
July 14, 1906, W. Shurtleff, New Haven strike.....	50.00
July 18, 1906, A. Huettner, L. U. No. 190 strike relief.....	150.00
July 25, 1906, Metal Dept. strike relief for 3 men.....	15.00
July 26, 1906, W. Goebeler, strike relief L. U. No. 176.....	150.00

Total amount strike benefit paid out to Aug. 1st.....\$7,795.00

## "THE INDUSTRIAL WORKER" FINANCIAL REPORT.

## RECEIPTS.

## EXPENDITURES.

December, 1905 .....	\$ 510.33	December, 1905 .....	\$ 76.89
January, 1906 .....	757.85	January, 1906 .....	140.70
February, 1906 .....	355.91	February, 1906 .....	392.74
March, 1906 .....	488.87	March, 1906 .....	725.42
April, 1906 .....	210.36	April, 1906 .....	314.05
May, 1906 .....	274.57	May, 1906 .....	328.79
June, 1906 .....	218.62	June, 1906 .....	315.67
July, 1906 .....	192.01	July, 1906 .....	332.45
Total .....	\$3,008.52	Total .....	\$2,626.71
Total receipts to August 1, 1906.....		Total .....	\$3,008.52
Total expenditures to August 1, 1906.....			2,626.71

Cash balance August 1, 1906.....\$ 381.81

## GENERAL DEFENSE FUND RECEIPTS. (Specified.)

Month.	Local Unions.	Mining Dept.	Metal Dept.	Trans. Dept.	Musical Unions.
July, 1905	\$ 43.80	\$ 168.00			
August, 1905	118.95		\$ 19.60		
September, 1905	159.85				\$ 25.97
October, 1905	243.40	434.00	19.60		
November, 1905	248.50	140.00	39.20		
December, 1905	248.65		28.00		31.36
January, 1906	266.30	1,680.00	35.00		
February, 1906	224.40	630.00	70.00		
March, 1906	334.00			\$ 5.81	
April, 1906	448.30		105.00	4.31	48.16
May, 1906	448.17	490.00	70.00	8.05	
June, 1906	436.79		70.00	11.34	
July, 1906	573.05		70.00	6.16	20.80
Total	\$3,794.16	\$3,542.00	\$526.40	\$ 35.67	\$126.29
Total					\$8,024.52

## GENERAL FUND FINANCIAL REPORT.

RECEIPTS.		EXPENDITURES.	
July, 1905	\$ 1,966.70	July, 1905	\$ 251.70
August, 1905	1,046.70	August, 1905	2,127.30
September, 1905	1,206.50	September, 1905	1,074.71
October, 1905	1,721.35	October, 1905	2,162.35
November, 1905	3,525.20	November, 1905	3,451.87
December, 1905	2,512.95	December, 1905	2,487.16
January, 1906	1,904.10	January, 1906	2,100.93
February, 1906	10,798.57	February, 1906	9,355.94
March, 1906	2,840.30	March, 1906	3,543.32
April, 1906	3,721.18	April, 1906	2,986.16
May, 1906	5,086.03	May, 1906	4,328.56
June, 1906	3,303.77	June, 1906	4,339.13
July, 1906	5,207.08	July, 1906	3,925.93
Total	\$44,840.43	Total	\$42,135.06
Total receipts to August 1, 1906			\$44,840.43
Total expenditures to August 1, 1906			42,135.06

Cash balance ..... \$ 2,706.37

## RECAPITULATION.

Cash balance August 1, 1906	\$ 2,705.37
Cash balance, August 1, 1906, Paper Fund	381.81
Cash balance, August 1, 1906, Moyer and Haywood Fund	221.70
Total cash to August 1, 1906, for three funds	\$3,308.88

A total of \$10,982.51 was collected for the defense of our injured fellow workers, Moyer, Haywood, Pettibone and St. John. The total cost to the fund for mass meetings, printing, speakers, etc., was \$1,010.89. The expense was very reasonable on account of the great amount of work done in arousing public sentiment in favor of the imprisoned men as well as collecting a substantial sum for their defense.

While Ex-President Sherman was on the floor of the Convention last week he charged that the Labor News Co. was favored in the matter of printing bills. The fact is that the Joliet Republican Printing Co., in which Sherman is said to be interested, received \$4,926.49 from our funds during the past year, while the bill of the Labor News Co. foots up but \$870.38. The manager of the Joliet Republican Printing Co. exercised much influence over Ex-President Sherman, and dictated the discharge of at least one organizer, because said organizer, Philip Veal, was an offense to pure and simpledom.

The expenditures of the Ex-General President show gross extravagance and strong evidence of corruption. During a period of thirty-three days he flung away on a junketing trip, not a single local being organized by him at any time, the sum of \$731.55, about twenty-two dollars per day. All this in addition to his salary; \$438.90 of the sum mentioned was for hotel bills and unitemized outlays, or \$13.30 per day.

We incorporate in our report his own statement of expenses, for which he insisted on receiving payment, and for which he did receive payment, as evidence that we are not exaggerating. It will show that according to his own account he wasted a total of \$2,512.43 in little more than half a year. He drew his salary in addition and organized not a single local.

#### INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD. TO W. E. TRAUTMANN.

Dear Sir and Brother Worker:—

I herewith submit my expense account, dating from August 3rd, 1905, to October 5th, 1905.

---

Transportation from Chicago to Butte, Mont.....	\$ 53.00
Telegrams and telephone messages.....	7.40
From Butte to Helena, covering all expenses for two.....	13.50
Brom Butte to Anaconda and return, for two.....	6.00
Stenographic work .....	4.80
Cash returned to W. E. Trautmann.....	20.00
Necessary street car, extra meals, hotel and incidentals.....	188.40
Transportation from Butte to Chicago.....	53.00
	<hr/>
	\$346.10

August 25th, left Chicago for New York.

---

Transportation .....	\$ 27.00
Transportation, New York to Boston.....	7.00
Railroad and boat transportation, Boston to Halifax.....	34.80
Railroad fare, Boston to Springfield.....	2.50
Springfield to Albany.....	3.70
Albany to New York .....	2.90
New York to Buffalo.....	8.80
Buffalo to Detroit.....	6.00
Detroit to Cleveland.....	4.50
Cleveland to Chicago .....	12.00
Stenographic work .....	18.40
All street car fares.....	12.00
Telegrams .....	6.35
Hotel, meals, necessary incidental expenses.....	259.50
Cash returned to W. E. Trautmann.....	20.00
	<hr/>
	\$425.45

Making a total of \$771.55 for all expenses from August 3rd to October 5th, 1905.

Received check for Two Hundred and Fifty Dollars.....	\$250.00
Drew check at Butte for One Hundred Dollars.....	100.00
August 25, received check for Two Hundred and Fifty Dollars..	250.00
Drew check in Boston for One Hundred and Forty Dollars.....	140.00
Drew check at Detroit for Nine Dollars.....	9.00
Total .....	<u>\$749.00</u>

Chicago, Nov. 8, 1906.

To W. E. Trautmann,  
General Secretary-Treasurer.

Dear Sir:—

I herewith submit my expense account, dating from October 20th to November 6th, 1905.

Railroad fare—Chicago to St. Louis.....	\$ 9.50
Railroad fare—St. Louis to Kansas City.....	9.50
Railroad fare—Kansas City to Omaha.....	7.40
Railroad fare—Omaha to Chicago.....	13.75
Telegrams .....	1.75
Hotel .....	32.85
Meals and extra meals.....	28.50
Car fare and necessary incidentals.....	41.75
Total .....	<u>\$145.00</u>

Expense account, dating from Nov. 18 to Dec. 18, 1906:

Railroad fare, Chicago to New York.....	\$ 27.00
Meals .....	3.50
Telegrams .....	.90
Hotel, New York .....	15.00
New York meals, car fares, necessary incidentals.....	67.30
Railroad fare, New York to Schenectady.....	4.50
Hotel, Schenectady .....	2.00
Railroad fare, Schenectady-Gloversville and return.....	1.20
Gloversville Hotel .....	2.00
Gloversville, meals and incidentals .....	4.35
Railroad fare—Schenectady to Boston.....	7.00
Boston hotel .....	11.00
Boston meals .....	15.60
Boston, extra room for conference, incidentals.....	38.30
Telegrams .....	1.75
Stenographer, Boston .....	10.90
Railroad fare, Boston to New York.....	7.00
New York, hotel .....	10.50
Meals, incidentals, car fare, Sherman and Debs.....	54.40
Hotel, Debs .....	8.00
Railroad fare, Quincy, Ill., to New York, for Debs.....	32.00
Railroad fare, New York-Terre Haute, Debs.....	31.00
Extra room for conference of cap makers.....	2.00
Telegrams from New York.....	6.60
Stenographer, New York .....	19.00
Railroad fare from New York to Chicago.....	27.00

Train meals .....	4.00
To Debs .....	50.00
Total expenses .....	\$463.80
Salary, Voucher No. 336 .....	150.00
	<hr/>
	\$613.80
Received check No. 201, Two Hundred Dollars .....	\$200.00
Received check No. 202, One Hundred Dollars .....	100.00
Received check No. 205, Seventy-five Dollars .....	75.00
Received check No. 239, Eighty-five Dollars .....	85.00
Received check No. 240, One Hundred Dollars .....	100.00
Received check No. 304, Fifty Dollars .....	50.00
	<hr/>
	\$610.00
Received cash .....	\$ 3.80
Total received .....	<hr/>
	\$613.80

## Expense account, from February 10, 1906, to March 27, 1906:

Railroad fare, Chicago to Cincinnati .....	\$ 10.00
Incidentals for agitation .....	4.00
Hotel and meals .....	3.75
Railroad fare, Cincinnati to Toledo .....	8.00
Hotel and meals .....	10.00
Agitation and incidentals .....	2.00
Railroad fare, Toledo to Pittsburg .....	10.50
Room and hotel .....	7.50
Meals .....	12.50
Agitation incidentals .....	9.50
Stenographer .....	3.50
Railroad fare from Pittsburg to New York .....	12.50
Sleeper to Washington .....	2.00
Washington, hotel .....	3.00
Meals .....	3.50
Incidental agitation .....	4.00
Baltimore, hotel .....	4.00
Meals .....	5.75
Agitation incidentals .....	8.50
Telegrams .....	1.25
Stenographer .....	4.90
Philadelphia, hotel .....	4.00
Meals .....	5.75
Agitation incidentals .....	8.50
Telegrams .....	1.00
Transportation from New York to Boston .....	7.00
Hotel .....	13.50
Meals .....	14.50
Agitation incidentals .....	21.00
New Bedford and return—transportation .....	2.60
Hotel and meals—New Bedford .....	2.50
Stenographer .....	4.90
Postage .....	1.50
Stenographer .....	6.90
Postage .....	2.00
Railroad fare, Boston-Leominster and return .....	2.57
Agitation incidentals .....	2.90

Telegram .....	.25
Telegram .....	.70
Railroad fare—Boston to New York.....	7.00
Telegrams .....	1.40
Telephone .....	.50
Stenographer .....	3.80
Postage .....	.50
New York, hotel.....	8.00
Meals .....	9.50
Agitation incidentals .....	39.40
Railroad fare, Paterson and return (for two).....	1.60
Railroad fare, New York to Buffalo.....	8.00
Meals on the road.....	.80
Telegram .....	.45
Telegram .....	.65
Stenographer .....	8.50
Postage .....	1.50
To I. Shapirc—services for organizer.....	10.00
Postage .....	4.07
Two telegrams .....	1.00
Stenographer .....	5.40
Postage .....	2.20
Telephone .....	.20
Hotel room .....	12.50
Meals .....	15.50
Agitation incidentals .....	44.00
Railroad fare—Buffalo to Hamilton.....	1.95
Hotel .....	3.00
Agitation incidentals .....	2.00
Hamilton to London.....	2.35
Hotel .....	3.50
Incidentals .....	2.80
Railroad fare—London to Buffalo.....	4.00
Stenographer .....	12.25
Postage .....	.60
Hotel .....	3.00
Meals .....	4.00
Incidental agitation .....	6.90
Railroad fare, Buffalo to Bradford, Pa.....	3.05
Hotel and meals.....	8.75
Agitation incidentals .....	5.60
Railroad fare, Bradford to New Castle.....	5.80
Hotel .....	6.00
Agitation incidentals .....	5.50
Railroad fare, New Castle to Canton....	3.90
Hotel .....	3.00
Agitation incidentals .....	7.00
Railroad fare from Canton to Chicago.....	11.60
Meals on road.....	1.00

---

**\$526.74**



## Received from W. E. Trautmann:

Check from office.....	\$250.00
Check at Boston.....	150.00
Check at Buffalo.....	200.00
Balance strike benefit check.....	30.00

Total received for trip.....	\$630.00
Total expenses for trip.....	526.74

Balance .....\$103.26

## Expense account to Terre Haute and return, April 7th, 1906:

Railroad fare, Terre Haute and return.....	\$ 13.72
Hotel .....	3.00
	\$ 16.72

Cash on hand.....	\$103.26
Expenses .....	16.72

Return .....\$ 86.54

## Expense account April 20th to May 8th, 1906:

Railroad fare from Chicago to Pittsburg.....	\$ 13.00
Hotel and meals in Pittsburg.....	5.00
Extra meals .....	4.50
Railroad fare, Pittsburg-Youngstown, for two.....	5.75
Hotel, Youngstown .....	2.75
Organizing incidentals .....	2.75
Railroad fare—Youngstown to Buffalo.....	8.45
Hotel .....	5.50
Organizing incidentals .....	3.00
Railroad fare from Buffalo to Rochester.....	2.62
Hotel .....	6.00
Organizing incidentals .....	7.80
Stenographer .....	2.00
Railroad fare from Rochester to Syracuse .....	1.90
Hotel and meals.....	7.00
Organizing incidentals .....	6.00
Railroad fare, Syracuse to Schenectady.....	3.80
Hotel, Schenectady .....	4.50
Organizing incidentals .....	4.80
Railroad fare from Schenectady to Jamestown.....	6.90
Hotel .....	7.80
Organizing incidentals .....	12.25
Railroad fare from Jamestown to Toronto.....	6.40
Hotel .....	3.50
Organizing incidentals .....	2.00
Railroad fare from Toronto to Chicago.....	14.45
Meals on road .....	2.00
Chicago, Rockford and return—railroad fare.....	5.70
Hotel .....	.75
	\$158.87

## Received—

On April 20th, check for.....	\$200.00
Expense .....	158.87

Cash balance .....\$ 41.13

Expense account, dating from May 9th, 1906, to June 30th, 1906:

Railroad fare from Chicago to Omaha.....	\$ 15.75
Meals on the road.....	2.00
Omaha, hotel .....	4.50
Agitation incidentals and extra meals.....	4.00
Railroad fare from Omaha to Lead City.....	21.75
Meals on the road.....	5.00
Hotel and meals.....	11.00
Agitation incidentals .....	13.00
Railroad fare from Lead City to Butte.....	29.95
Meals on the road.....	4.75
Telegram .....	1.05
Stenographer .....	7.00
Organizing incidentals .....	21.00
Hotel and meals .....	15.60
Railroad fare Anaconda and return (for two).....	2.80
Hotel (for two).....	4.00
Hotel at Butte.....	3.00
Meals .....	4.00
Organizing incidentals .....	9.00
Railroad fare Butte to Denver and return.....	35.00
Hotel, Salt Lake City .....	8.00
Organizing incidentals .....	3.50
Railroad fare—Salt Lake City, Bingham and return, for two..	3.40
Hotel and meals .....	4.50
Organizing incidentals .....	3.00
Railroad fare, Salt Lake City to Park City and return.....	5.00
Hotel, Park City.....	4.50
Organizing incidentals .....	3.50
Sleeper Salt Lake City to Denver .....	4.00
Meals on road .....	3.00
Telegrams .....	3.50
Hotel, Denver, with meals.....	55.00
Organizing incidentals .....	78.00
Sleeper from Denver to Butte.....	6.50
Meals on the road.....	4.00
Hotel at Butte.....	1.50
Railroad fare to Missoula and return for two.....	15.00
Hotel at Missoula .....	3.00
Organizing incidentals .....	6.00
Railroad fare from Butte to Anaconda and return.....	1.60
Hotel at Anaconda .....	2.00
Organizing incidentals .....	28.00
Railroad fare from Butte to Chicago.....	53.00
Meals on the road.....	5.00

**\$519.55**

Received—

On May 9th check at headquarters.....	\$300.00
Check at Denver .....	100.00
Check at Denver .....	150.00

Total .....	\$550.00
Expense .....	519.55

Balance ..... \$ 30.45

During 197 days he squandered the money of this organization at the rate of thirteen dollars per day. His accounts were as crudely kept as the amounts were excessive. He drew checks on the road of which the office learned only long afterward, and contracted obligations at his absolute dictation. He made himself an autocrat over the finances as he attempted to establish his power over the Convention.

The majority of the General Executive Board was his perfect tool. They winked at his irregularities, endorsed his extravagances and lent their efforts to perpetuate him on this organization as they are now lending their assistance to help him do his best to disrupt it. The loyal minority of the Board, Trautmann and Riordan, were powerless to stem the tide of reaction, malfeasance and dishonor. Against these two Sherman and the machine members of the Board voted consistently and solidly. They regarded the organization as their property and rebel because the membership represented in the Convention asserts authority.

We assert that the extravagance of ex-President Sherman was reprehensible; that his habit of putting in bills whose aggregate rises to hundreds of dollars under the heading of unnamed incidentals, calls for the severest censure. It would not be done by a man who was careful of a reputation for integrity, and he certainly misunderstood the spirit of our membership if he hoped to escape the stigma of acts that reek with the rottenest stench of the worst labor fakirism.

We find that the expense bill of the General Secretary-Treasurer, while on the road, was kept within the bounds of reason. His bill, mileage and expense, was \$474.05. But we believe that this officer should not be permitted to make extended tours of agitation. He should remain at headquarters and attend strictly to the duties of his office. Eloquent though he may be, experience shows that we have other orators enough to push the work of propaganda. He receives a salary to keep his accounts in order. This should be his first business, and in no case should it be subordinated to any other.

John Riordan has shown himself to be faithful to the organization in all things. His bill for services on the General Executive Board with mileage and expense was modest. \$179.50.

The record of Frank McCabe has been exposed to this Convention. The most vicious witness against him was himself. He has drawn \$462.50 from the funds for working for McCabe, and, in his own interest, supporting Sherman on the General Executive Board.

Chas. G. Kirkpatrick drew, besides his salary and expenses as President of an alleged department, from the coffers of the general organization, the sum of \$250.00.

F. W. Cronin drew \$712.00 for about two months scheming as aid to Sherman on the General Executive Board. Part of this amount, \$36.00, was for alleged work at a session held July, 1905, at a time when he was under pay from the American Labor Union.

C. E. Mahoney drew from the treasury of this organization \$355.40; \$44.30 of this was for propaganda in Butte; the remainder was for services, about a month on the General Executive Board, while at the same time he, according to his admission on the floor of the Convention, was, and is, drawing a salary of \$150.00 per month as acting president of the Mining Department of the I. W. W.

These men, McCabe, Kirkpatrick, Cronin and Mahoney, are now the supporters of Sherman in attempting to divide this organization, as they were in the immediate past his aids on the General Executive Board.

As to organizers, we find that those who received the highest salaries and basked most warmly in the smiles of the General ex-President, were the most inefficient. Among these, Wade Shurtleff of New York, per-

ambulating as the official of an alleged department, captured fifty dollars every two weeks with the regularity of clockwork for teaching pure and simple unionism and organizing wild-cat unions for the purpose of drawing strike benefits. Shurtleff also draws some emolument from his alleged department.

Daniel McDonald drew \$309.95 of your funds for alleged organizing, but real disorganizing. More than half this amount was paid under protest of the General Secretary-Treasurer. But Sherman overruled the protests and ordered the unfair and dishonest claims to be paid.

McCabe, Kirkpatrick, Cronin et al, were also paid certain smaller sums for alleged organizing. Not one of these men did any real or effective propaganda. Cranston, another of this ilk, long drew a forty percent rebate on collection of dues from members in Chicago; and this was done with the knowledge of Sherman.

Our conclusions are that during the past year extravagance and corruption have ruled at General Headquarters. The true interests of the organization have been neglected and overthrown in order that individuals might secure money and notoriety. The General Secretary-Treasurer had a hard fight on his hands and was hindered in the efficiency of his office by the conduct of Sherman. He has therefore this excuse for the tangle in his accounts, necessitating the employment of experts.

The man who came out of all the turmoil with particular honor is John Ricrdan.

We believe that many of the strikes for which benefits were paid could have been avoided and ought to have been avoided. The great need is for organizers who will train the workers to keep their eyes fixed on the great goal of complete emancipation, and teach them to shun as far as possible transient conflicts with their employers, in which the odds are ten to one against them, and which, even if won, result in only temporary and paltry advantages.

We believe that all the remarks and suggestions of the expert accountants are good. These should be adopted and put in practice at once, or as soon as possible.

We believe that the practice of certain officials accepting pay from a department and then charging the general organization for services rendered during the time they are under pay and accepting pay from another branch of the Industrial Workers of the World, is worthy of censure, and anyone guilty of this practice should be suspended from office.

Respectfully submitted,

WM. R. FOX, Chairman.

JAMES RUGG, Secretary.

E. R. MARKLEY.

Signed by the Committee.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: There is one question I want to ask, Mr. Chairman, because it will straighten out a few matters. You could not demand that the shortage of \$19 be made good if I can locate the check for \$29.50 that has been charged against me by the bank?

DEL. FOX: Why, certainly, if you can locate those checks, that is cleared up. But if the Secretary don't locate them he will have to pay that himself.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: So that will actually make a surplus of \$10.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have heard the report of the Auditing Committee. What is your pleasure.

It was moved and seconded to concur in the report.

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been regularly moved and seconded that the report of the Auditing Committee be accepted and that the recommendations of the committee be concurred in.

DEL. PARKS: And 100,000 copies be printed.

THE CHAIRMAN: That the recommendations of the committee be concurred in and the committee discharged. You have heard the motion; are you ready for the question? Are there any objections to granting unanimous consent?

DEL. FLASCHKAMP: I object, Mr. Chairman. (Laughter.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Any other objections? If not, the Chair will declare the motion carried.

DEL. DE LEON: Mr. Chairman, it has been well said that when governments want to hide a thing they publish it, the experience being that these publications are so voluminous that nobody reads them. In view of that I move you that the conclusion or the summary of this report be forthwith printed; that it be made part of a statement that this convention by a committee appointed by the Chair should issue to the membership; in that way the conclusions which are backed up by the previous figures are summarized and people can read them without falling asleep over these long columns of figures and thereby losing the point. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been regularly moved and seconded that the conclusions—

DEL. DE LEON: With a summary.

THE CHAIRMAN: That the summary of those conclusions be printed forthwith. You have heard the motion; are you ready for the question?

DEL. SHENKAN: I would like to ask Delegate De Leon if it would not be proper to have the letter or circular which is to be sent throughout the country explaining the actions—if it would not be proper for the circular to contain that idea?

DEL. DE LEON: My motion embodied that idea and stated that that be embodied in the statement which I hope this convention—which I know this convention will issue to the membership.

DEL. SHENKAN: Then I would suggest that some of the main figures stated therein be quoted; not alone the conclusion, but some of the figures.

DEL. DE LEON: The figures are in the conclusions.

DEL. RITCHER: Along the same line I want to suggest that in the statement be embodied a sample of those expenses—one of them to substantiate the total sum.

DEL. PARKS: I would like to ask a question. Does this motion preclude the detailed publication of the report of this committee in the proceedings?

DEL. DE LEON: No.

DEL. PARKS: Now, I agree with Brother De Leon when he says that publishing a voluminous document on public business or any other kind of business will tend to squelch it, that it won't be understood; but I believe when it comes down to the concrete proposition of Sherman's expenses and outgoes, I believe everybody can understand that, and I think that it would be wise for this incoming Executive Board to embody the whole of Sherman's personal expense account so that they will know why we deposed that official.

DEL. DE LEON: I understand my motion does not bar the publication of this document. I understand this document will be published. My motion is simply that the summary be embodied in the statement that this convention is to issue to the membership, the several suggestions that were made, and that besides embodying that they take some of the extracts as simply typical examples of things of that sort. That goes without saying.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection?

DEL. HOLMES: I would like to ask, for a point of information, if those two letters read by Brother Sims are going to be embodied?

THE CHAIRMAN: They will be embodied if the committee sees fit to use them. They are going to be placed before this committee.

DEL. RITCHER: That was acted upon.

THE CHAIRMAN: The chances are that if they are pertinent they will be used. Is there any objection to unanimous consent being granted to concurring in this motion? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

#### COMMITTEE TO ISSUE STATEMENT.

DEL. DE LEON: I rise to make a motion that the Chair appoint a committee which shall draw up a statement to be forthwith issued to the membership of this organization. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded that the Chair appoint a committee to draw up a statement to be submitted at once to the membership in regard to this convention; you have heard the motion; are you ready for the question?

DEL. PARKS: I will raise the point of order that we have already provided that the G. E. B. shall do that.

DEL. DE LEON: I was not aware of that.

THE CHAIRMAN: What action do you desire to take on this motion?

DEL. PARKS: My point of order is that this morning the Good and Welfare Committee covered that proposition, and that it is unnecessary to take further action.

THE CHAIRMAN: Your point of order is well taken. The motion is out of order.

DEL. KLEESE: Have all the committees reported?

DEL. SHENKAN: I have a supplemental report to make which the Executive Board requests from the Committee on Reports of Officers. It is not very long; it is merely a matter of form.

DEL. SIMS: I would like to ask if the Good and Welfare Committee did not propose that the General Executive Board should take that matter in hand. In view of that, shouldn't the matter be submitted to the General Executive Board for action?

#### COMMITTEE ON REPORTS OF OFFICERS.

DEL. SHENKAN: Supplementary report of Committee on Reports of Officers. Your committee has examined the proceedings of the General Executive Board for the past year, and recommend, first, that the minutes of the General Executive Board shall either be pasted into a scrap book consecutively arranged or be written in a regular minute book. We recommend that the minutes of all such be placed on file for future reference. The report of the Secretary-Treasurer has been referred to the Auditing Committee. As to Fellow Worker John Riordan's report as member of the General Executive Board, we deem it unnecessary to make any report, since the first part of same refers mainly to the struggles of the organization in the past, while on the other hand his recommendations have all of them practically been embodied in the Constitution by the action of this convention, as well as the minutes of the General Executive Board practically.

Fraternally submitted,

I. SHENKAN, Secy.,

W. E. McCUE,

W. E. TULLAR,

Committee.

(On motion, unanimously concurred in.)

## PAY OF G. E. B. MEMBERS.

DEL. SHENKAN: There is one matter that has been left undone that we ought to attend to. I believe it was either the Committee on Organization or the Committee on Constitution that recommended to this convention that the convention provide for a scale of wages or rate of pay to be paid to the Executive Board members while they are under instructions doing work for the organization, while they are in session. And I would make a motion that they be paid at the rate of \$3.00 a day and expenses and railroad fare.

(Seconded by Del. Parks.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been regularly moved and seconded that the rate of pay of members of the General Executive Board while in session shall be \$3.00 a day and expenses and railroad fare. Is that your motion?

DEL. SHENKAN: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have heard the motion. Are there any objections to granting unanimous consent? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

## PROPOSITION TO INSTALL.

DEL. PARKS: Mr. Chairman, I move that Brother John Riordan, the only member of the Executive Board present, now take the Chair and install the new incoming Executive Board. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair will rule that motion out of order at the present time. If there is no objection the Committee on Officers' Reports will be discharged. The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. Has the Strike and Lockout Committee any report to make? If there is no objection the Committee on Strikes and Lockouts will be discharged. So ordered.

## CONSTITUTION AS A WHOLE.

THE CHAIRMAN: Has the Committee on Constitution any further report to make?

DEL. DE LEON: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: Having no report, if there is no objection the Committee on Constitution will be discharged.

DEL. TULLAR: Wouldn't a motion be in order to accept now their entire report?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

DEL. TULLAR: I move you that the Constitution Committee's report be accepted in its entirety. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: You have heard the motion that the Constitution Committee's report be accepted as a whole. Are there any objections to granting unanimous consent?

DEL. SHENKAN: Does that imply to accept the constitution as amended as a whole?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

DEL. KLEESE: I want to talk to that motion. There are several paragraphs in the by-laws to the constitution that are not by any means in line with industrial unionism, and I want to get this convention to change them before we adjourn. That can be very easily done, and the Constitution Committee has not taken them in hand. Now, I think they should come up before the Constitution Committee is discharged. The chairman can suit himself about that.

A DELEGATE: What are they?

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion before the house is to accept the committee's report as a whole.

DEL. FRENCH: A question of information. Does the adoption or acceptance of the committee's report as a whole preclude the possibility of making such amendments as are necessary in order to straighten out this constitution and make it in line with the amendments that are already adopted?

THE CHAIRMAN: There are resolutions passed by this body which, in the opinion of the Chair, fix that point. The General Executive Board is constituted a Committee on Style to see that the constitution is put together in conformity with those amendments adopted.

#### MONTHLY DUES.

DEL. FRENCH: There is one pretty important point that the Committee on Style cannot handle in line with the things that have already been done. For instance, on page 14, initiation fee for members of local unions, that has been settled; but the next sentence in that paragraph has not been altered. It says that the monthly dues shall be 50 cents per month, together with such assessments, &c. Now, the point is that changing the per capita tax does not affect this part that says the monthly dues for local unions shall be 50 cents a month. The change of per capita is a very different proposition. The point is that I want a chance to amend that so that we strike out that 50 and put in the words "not less than one dollar." That gives us a chance in the sections where small dues must be had in the locals. It gives us a chance to take 25, 35, 40, 50, or anything we please in accordance with our position to pay. And it also gives a chance to the miners out in the mountains where they can pay a dollar and use that money to carry on propaganda work. Let them charge less if a dollar is too much, and charge their dollar if they want to. I want a chance to be able to make a motion that that fifty cents be changed to "no more than one dollar a month." (Seconded). Is a motion to that effect now in order?

THE CHAIRMAN: If the convention desires to consider it I don't care.

DEL. SHENKAN: I second the motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection on the part of any delegate to considering this? You can make the motion then.

DEL. FRENCH: Then I move you that in this paragraph that contains those words on page 14, that after the word "be" there shall be inserted "not more than one dollar," and the words "fifty cents" shall be stricken out. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any objections to granting unanimous consent to this amendment? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion before the house is to accept the Committee on Constitution's report as a whole and discharge the committee. Are there any objections.

DEL. DUNCAN: I object.

DEL. HOLMES: I object.

THE CHAIRMAN: If there are no further objections—the Chair hears none, and the motion is declared carried and the committee discharged.

#### TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT.

DEL. FITZGERALD: I rise to make a motion at this time that the incoming General Executive Board shall immediately take charge of the affairs of the Transportation Department. The reason why I say that is this: That McCabe promised us on the floor that he



would be on the firing line, whether he would be with us or against us, and we find that he is on the firing line against us. Therefore, I think that the sooner this General Executive Board will take hold of the Transportation Department and take it under their supervision away from this reactionary bunch, the better it will be for the general organization; if I can get a second to that. (Seconded.)

#### M. & M. DEPARTMENT.

DEL. SIMS: I second the motion, with an amendment. I would like to amend that motion, that this General Executive Board also will take charge of the supposed Metal Department.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection to the amendment?

DEL. SHENKAN: I would like to have it embodied; I don't want to make another amendment unless it is necessary. I would like to have it embodied in either the motion or amendment that when we adjourn that the whole convention march in a body to the general headquarters and take possession of these headquarters and fire the fakirs out.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair is of the opinion that you want to start a riot. (Laughter.) The motion is, as the Chair understands it, that upon adjournment the General Executive Board be instructed to take charge of the affairs of the Transportation and Metal and Machinery Departments. Are there any objections?

DEL. FLASCHKAMP: I object.

#### POSSESSION OF GENERAL OFFICES.

DEL. McINTOSH: Let me make a motion—

DEL. SHENKAN: We find today that the ex-General President as well as McCabe and Kirkpatrick are today using all the office furniture, office rooms and stationery, and perhaps our funds as well, of the Metal Department and Transportation Department, evidently for the purpose of disrupting this organization if possible, and that is the reason I want that embodied in the original motion.

A DELEGATE: We don't want anything of that kind.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair is unable—

DEL. PARKS: This motion supposes us going over there like a mob.

A DELEGATE: No, not a mob.

DEL. PARKS: This motion is that we go over there in a body. I believe the Executive Board will act with discretion.

DEL. FRENCH: A point of order. Is it not a fact that the mere fact of the evolution of those departments as such makes it the obvious duty of the General Executive Board to take hold of all the locals and all the machinery connected with those former supposed departments, and that there is no need even for a motion for the Executive Board? It is understood that the previous General Executive Board took hold without any motion at all.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair is of the opinion that your point is well taken, and that instead of simplifying matters this motion would tend to put them in a position to claim that the convention did not recognize its acts. Dissolving a department is putting them out of office.

DEL. PARKS: That is correct.

(Question called for.)

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is out of order.

DEL. MOSKOWITZ: If there is nothing before the house just at present—

THE CHAIRMAN: There is something before the house. The order of business is before the house.

#### ELECTION OF EDITOR.

DEL. MOSKOWITZ: I move that we proceed with the election of the editor. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded that we proceed with the election of the editor. If there is no objection the Chair will call for nominations.

A. S. Edwards was nominated by Del. De Leon.

DEL. SIMS: I move that the nominations be closed.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any objections to granting unanimous consent to the motion to close? The Chair hears none, and will declare it carried. The Secretary is instructed to cast the ballot of this convention for Bro. Edwards.

#### AMENDMENTS IN PRINT.

DEL. KLEESE: I would like to ask you for a point of information. Are we going to have the rest of the amendments in print?

THE CHAIRMAN: They will be here about three o'clock.

DEL. HAVER: I would like to ask whether before we leave we will get the amendments to the constitution that are already in print?

THE CHAIRMAN: I have been informed that they will be here at three o'clock.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: I wish to announce that Edwards, the present incumbent, is elected unanimously editor of the Industrial Worker.

#### PLACE OF NEXT MEETING.

THE CHAIRMAN: The next order of business is the place of next year's convention.

DEL. SIMS: Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that the city which I am from, namely, Milwaukee, has gone on record as being the source from which all the reactionism that exists in the United States of America emanates, I am going to make a motion that the next ensuing convention be held in Milwaukee, for the express purpose of carrying on the necessary propaganda. Now, I don't want to detain you here, brother delegates, in elaborating upon the necessity of holding the next convention in the city of Milwaukee, only I feel that it is absolutely necessary that we should bring a few points to bear. I have been an organizer in the city of Milwaukee, and practically buried there by the past Executive Board and officialdom of the organization, and I have been enabled by my work in Milwaukee to know from the personal talk and personal experience and also from the past experience that I have had in the labor movement, that it is a truth, that it is not a fallacy, that it is not imagination, but it is a real solid truth, that Milwaukee today is the head of reactionism. From Milwaukee today, in the trades union movement, comes the reactionism that is supposed to come from the headquarters in Washington. The general heads of the American Federation of Labor or pure and simple doms are supposed to be in Washington, but I want to say it is not so.

DEL. HESLEWOOD: I will have to raise a point of order. Whether Berger controls the American Federation of Labor or any other Socialist or the rank and file or anybody else, has nothing to

do with the convention being held at that place. If Bro. Sims wants to nominate a town, all right.

DEL. SIMS: He is in the American Federation of Labor organization and functions in that organization to the extent of controlling and dictating quite a lot of its activity, and the actions all over the country are absolutely concentrated there and directed from that place. I hold that if the Industrial Workers of the World will hold their next annual convention in the city of Milwaukee that more good can be accomplished or as much good can be accomplished by that one act as two years of activity of any two organization out the United States of America, and I believe it is obvious to all who are familiar with the records that Milwaukee is exactly the place where the Industrial Workers of the World should hold their next convention. Hence I move you that that be the next place for our convention.

DEL. RYAN: The point that Del. Sims has brought out as trying to show why we should hold the next convention at Milwaukee is that that is the home of reactionism. He brought out the name of Victor Berger. Milwaukee is a reactionary city, but we know that the home of true reactionism is in Chicago, where Sherman, McCabe and Kirkpatrick live, and I move you that we hold that convention here. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any further nominations?

DEL. SCHWEINBURG: Mr. Chairman and brother delegates, as much as I would be in favor of the next convention at Milwaukee, I am against it just as well. We can say that we are only closing here today the first convention of the Industrial Workers of the World. During the last sixteen days we have been sitting here in this hall trying to straighten out the affairs of the organization so as to be enabled to work hand in hand to help the rank and file of this organization. We don't know today what may happen next year. Our general officers, situated in the city of Chicago may use the books or any documents that refer to this convention, at next year's convention, and therefore I move you to have the next convention here in the city of Chicago.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any further nominations?

DEL. AUGUSTINE: I move that the next convention be held in St. Louis, Mo., because I believe it is a more central location and will be less expensive to all delegates concerned for the next convention to be held there.

DEL. MOSKOWITZ: I move to close the nominations for the convention. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any objections to closing the nominations? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

A DELEGATE: Call the roll.

DEL. VEAL: Is Pittsburgh included? I heard one of the delegates mention it.

THE CHAIRMAN: I didn't hear Pittsburgh.

The ballot was then taken on place of next meeting.

#### EXPLANATION.

DEL. VEAL: I desire to make a statement, just in a few moments, going over a few of these occurrences, as to why I voted for Milwaukee. It has been a minority vote. But the position Comrade Sims has taken will show in the next few years that the sooner we turn our batteries on Milwaukee the sooner we will knock out that connection with the A. F. of L., and were it possible to put an

army of speakers there that can be put there where we want to be fighting the reactionaries, within the next year we could knock out the false notions there, and in two years we could put an end to Bergerism and A. F. of L.-ism in Milwaukee, and with that knocked out you would weaken the forces of the A. F. of L. to an extent that it would not recover from, due to the fact of having that experience, in Milwaukee and Chicago and throughout the whole of the country. That is the reason I voted for Milwaukee.

The Chairman appointed Del. Veal in place of Del. Haver to attend a meeting of the Window Washers.

The ballot was then announced, as follows: Chicago, 331; St. Louis, 30; Milwaukee, 15.

THE CHAIRMAN: By your vote you have selected Chicago as the place of the next convention.

#### DISBURSEMENTS OF FUNDS.

DEL. RYAN: If I am not out of order, I would like to bring up the question as to how checks will be issued in the future by the Industrial Workers of the World for disbursements. I would like to bring before the convention and find out if they are to be signed and countersigned.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: That is right.

DEL. FISCHER: I move you that they shall be countersigned by the Chairman of the Local Committee.

DEL. KLEESE: What Local Committee?

DEL. FISCHER: The Local Executive Board appointed.

DEL. KLEESE: And who else?

DEL. FISCHER: By the Financial Secretary and countersigned by the Chairman of the Local Executive Board.

DEL. MOSKOWITZ: I make a motion that this be left in the hands of the Secretary, and he provide the best way possible.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: You can't do that.

DEL. SHENKAN: I would like to know, before I make a definite motion, how many the Local Executive Board will be composed of.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is left with the General Executive Board to appoint the Local Quorum.

DEL. SHENKAN: Then since there is no definite number, I would like to make a motion that it requires the signatures of two-thirds of the members of the Local Executive Board to draw any checks.

(Manifestations of disapproval.)

DEL. LINGENFELTER: I have a motion that will settle it quick. I move you that we table that motion.

DEL. SIMS: Mr. Chairman, in view of the past experience we have had concerning our financial affairs, I believe it might be well for this convention while here assembled to take cognizance of the fact and devise some means by which the finances of this organization can be secured to the organization as a whole. While we have all confidence in the officials that we have selected, yet our past experience in this organization has proven that two men or one individual in this organization could tie up the entire finances of this organization. Now, profiting by past experience, I believe it would be well for this convention now to devise a suitable means by which the finances of this organization can be absolutely in the control of this organization and not in the control of one or two individuals. Hence I am going to move you, Mr. Chairman, that our banking system will be so controlled that a committee of the Executive Board will have the control of the finances and empower the General Secretary-Treasurer and Assistant General Secretary-Treasurer to draw with their signatures, but that the finances of this organization will be deposited in the name of this com-

mittee and that they keep control at all times. I move that as a motion. (Seconded.)

DEL. TULLAR: I offer a suggestion. It has been recommended to this convention that the General Executive Board—

DEL. SIMS: A point of order. There was a second to that motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair didn't catch the second. It has been regularly moved and seconded that the Executive Board have charge of the finances of this organization and that they empower the Secretary-Treasurer and the Assistant Secretary-Treasurer to draw checks on the same. You have heard the motion. Are there any remarks?

DEL. TULLAR: Can't the funds be deposited in the name of the Industrial Workers of the World, the General Executive Board?

DEL. SHENKAN: Not as individuals.

DEL. LINGENFELTER: A point of order. My point of order is that the General Executive Board having been empowered to arrange a financial system of the organization, it follows then that since they have been empowered to arrange the new financial system of the organization, any motion at this time is out of order and superfluous, because they have all that power now by the action of this convention.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair will rule Del. Sims' motion is in order.

DEL. TULLAR: It has been decided by this convention that the General Executive Board shall appoint a resident sub-committee, and the resident sub-committee is to be responsible to the General Executive Board. Now, we have on that General Executive Board a Chicago resident, and I maintain that in my opinion the proper course for us to pursue is to require the Chicago resident of that Executive Board to countersign the checks.

DEL. RICHTER: Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the convention at this time is not in a position to dispose of the matter, especially so as we are going through an experience that reminds us of the fact that we are in a capitalist society and there are certain laws by which their banking system is run. The evidence shows that the bank will not recognize any change in officials except that the official deposited voluntarily withdraws his authority to sign checks. Now, it seems to me if this organization will be true to itself some investigation ought to be had to find out the laws governing this matter and make such arrangement for signing our checks as will leave us free from the embarrassment prevailing in regard to the matter. So it seems to me that the best course would be that the Executive Committee appoint a special committee to investigate the matter and from their investigation devise a means that will secure the best interests of this organization.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: As a safeguard against the repetition of such occurrences it would be inadvisable to deposit the money under the name of the Industrial Workers of the World as today, and if the bank will permit such a stipulation, that any one individual may draw the money; that the General Executive Board as the superior authority has a right to give notice to the bank at any given time that this or that individual or this servant of the organization has no right to draw any money from a certain date on, if they so decide. That would eliminate such things as we have seen during this convention. As I said before, have the money deposited by the Industrial Workers of the World, and inform the bank that this individual, whoever it may be, is not allowed to draw any money after a certain date if they so decide. That would preclude such complications in the future. But as to anything like depositing in the name of the Industrial Workers of the World but allowing three or four names to go on the check, the bank will not submit to it and will not do it.

DEL. AUGUSTINE: What is the motion before the house?

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is that the money be deposited in the name of the organization and in the control of the General Executive Board, and they have the power to designate the Secretary and Assistant Secretary to sign checks to draw it.

DEL. AUGUSTINE: That is practically what I want.

DEL. PARKS: I am going to move a substitute for the whole, that the General Executive Board shall have power to select one of the Local Executive Board who shall have power to countersign all checks and financial orders in the name of the Industrial Workers of the World during the will of the General Executive Board, subject to the will of the next convention; provided that no Local Executive Board member shall have the above power to countersign unless he is under a bond of not less than \$10,000 payable to the General Executive Board of the Industrial Workers of the World or to the order of the next convention.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Then it would be just as well to have it include the Assistant Secretary.

DEL. TULLAR: The Secretary would have to give bond.

DEL. PINKERTON: Is there a motion before the house?

THE CHAIRMAN: There is a motion before the house.

DEL. PINKERTON: I would like to make an amendment that the General Executive Board shall have charge of all of the funds and make appropriations for the running expenses of the organization, such appropriations to be subject to draft by the General Secretary-Treasurer and Assistant Secretary-Treasurer.

DEL. RYAN: If I understand the course of proceedings, we are referring all this business to the incoming General Executive Board, and I know Delegates Trautmann and Riordan have had a good deal of experience in this matter, and I move that the whole matter be laid on the table. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded that this matter be laid on the table. You have heard the motion, are you ready for the question?

DEL. SIMS: The motion to lay this on the table is a serious proposition, I admit. It is a serious proposition. To leave this in the hands of the General Executive Board is delegating a power to the General Executive Board that they don't have just yet. This convention has not adjourned sine die, and this convention certainly has the power to dictate and determine the future action of this General Executive Board. Now—

DEL. RYAN: A point of order; that this motion is not debatable.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair will sustain the point of order.

Roll call demanded.

DEL. SIMS: I am not debating the motion to lay on the table. (Laughter.)

THE CHAIRMAN: That is the only thing that you have done.

DEL. SIMS: I think this is a kind of proxy proposition, to make a motion of that kind. It is not just right and proper.

Roll call demanded.

THE CHAIRMAN: Call the roll.

DELEGATES: General consent.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any objections to granting unanimous consent to laying the motion on the table?

Delegates Sims, Holmes and Parks objected.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any further objections? If there are no further objections—

DEL. RICE: I object.

**THE CHAIRMAN:** Call the roll.

The roll call was then completed and the result announced as follows: Total vote, 300; yes, 217; no, 43.

**THE CHAIRMAN:** The motion is carried. The next order of business before the convention is the installation of officers.

**DEL.** — Before you call that up I would like to offer a suggestion that I think the Executive Board would take, which, without making a motion to put the convention on record, would materially assist the Executive Board. It is that our Executive Board immediately inform the Prairie State Bank that from this date on they do not recognize any checks drawn by Charles G. Kirkpatrick or George J. Cannedy of the so-called Metal Department.

**A DELEGATE:** Or Charles O. Sherman.

**SEC. TRAUTMANN:** We will attend to that, but we are handicapped by some laws, and a resolution of this convention cannot change them.

#### INSTALLATION OF OFFICERS.

Del. St. John then vacated the chair, which was taken by Del. Rioran, who installed the newly elected officers, namely, General Secretary-Treasurer William E. Trautmann, and members of the General Executive Board, Delegates Vincent St. John, Fred W. Heslewood and Eugene Fischer, and the officers pledged themselves accordingly, the ceremony being followed by applause.

Del. Ryan opened and passed around among the delegates a box of red label cigars.

#### DEL. PINKERTON—PERSONAL.

**DEL. PINKERTON:** On behalf of the Transportation Department of the Industrial Workers of the World I can assure you that when we attended this convention it was with a degree of apprehension that perhaps it might have met with similar conditions at your hands that the tributary organizations to the American Federation of Labor have met. I have heard it said a great many times that because of our political place, etc., in this organization we would never receive justice at the hands of the revolutionists. There has not been a revolutionist in this organization that has asked me what my political place was. The railroad corporations term me a dynamiter. The conservatives, I suppose, now term me a revolutionist. But up till the time that I entered this convention door I have always been a William Jennings Bryan democrat. Consequently it cannot be said that this convention did not do justice to all alike. But I wish to state that since William Jennings Bryan landed in New York and since his advocacy of government ownership of a part and not of the whole, that I am going to attach myself to the revolutionists. (Applause.) It is with a degree of gratitude that you cannot estimate or feel that I thank you for the justice that you have shown to the Transportation Department. (Applause.)

#### PHOTOGRAPHS.

**DEL AUGUSTINE:** Mr. Chairman and delegates, there was a matter attended to at the last convention that has not been attended to here. The last convention—a portion rather of the convention—had photographs taken. We have not attempted that as yet, and I understand a photographer is now on the way to take our pictures, and I don't think that the delegates would like to go away from here without having a group picture taken. I understand that the photographer is here now, and I would request the delegates to allow him to pose us for a photograph immediately after adjournment.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair is at a loss to see how taking any photographs is going to help emancipate the wage slaves. Those delegates that desire to get their picture taken can do it. As far as I am concerned I don't care to have mine taken.

#### THE COAL FIELD AND POLITICAL POSITION.

DEL. McINTOSH: Mr. Chairman, there was a matter brought up here some time ago that I am going to mention. I believe the convention agreed unanimously to give Fellow-Worker Cox the floor to explain the situation in regard to the coal miners, and he has not yet had it.

DEL. SIMS: I move that he be granted the floor twenty minutes. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: If there is no objection Del. Cox will have the floor.

DEL. COX: Mr. Chairman and fellow-delegates, I am not going to contend for the floor for that twenty minutes, you having considered it enough to understand the proposition. Therefore I leave the proposition with you and with the Executive Board. I am sure that every delegate in this convention is now convinced of the necessity of sending organizers into the coal fields and organizing them, and that they are fully prepared and ready to come to the I. W. W. There is one point, however, that I want to make, since you have given me the floor, and that is this: That when these organizers go into the field from this convention, in view of the fact that assertions have been made in the past year in reference to some of our organizers—I refer to those that have been deposed, that are after pushing the political proposition to the front—that were deposed—that is the main objection that C. O. Sherman found to the majority of the organizers that he deposed—I want to make a statement and make it emphatic, that this assertion of his was a lie made of whole cloth, and from a personal standpoint I can substantiate this. That is one of the reasons for deposing me, and I want to say that it is a lie. Now, I want to ask every organizer or every man that goes forth to talk and agitate for the Industrial Workers of the World that he stand upon the economic foundation and not bring in the political question in reference to any connection with this organization. (Applause.) Ever since I came into the revolutionary movement I have been a fighter upon the firing line under the auspices of the Socialist Labor party, and I am not ashamed of it; I am proud of it. Yet I take the position, and I want it distinctly understood by these delegates that the economic and the political organization have a distinct and separate work to do, and the one is not to conflict with the other, and that the line cannot be drawn between the two except as I say the one has a distinct work as well as the other, and the man or woman who is out representing the Industrial Workers of the World should not bring any political party in connection. To illustrate, I want to give you an answer to a question that was asked me night before last—on the box, in this city. A man asked me this question: "What do you consider is the political party of the working class?" I said, "The position of the Industrial Workers of the World is that the foundation of the revolutionary movement is the economic organization, and that the economic movement is to reflect the political. The Industrial Workers of the World is a baby only one year old, with a membership of 60,000. I take the position, and I believe it is the position of the organization when I speak it, that as yet this baby cannot be that political reflex and the political party that is to represent the working class is not yet born." That is my answer to his question, and that is my position. I thank you. (Applause.)



THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any further business before the convention?

DEL. TULLAR: I would like to ask a question, inasmuch as we are virtually waiting for the report of our Constitution Committee. It has been stated upon the floor of this convention that certain men representing—or rather organizers of the Industrial Workers of the World—have stepped over the boundary line, and upon the platform when they were supposed to be pushing industrial unionism have stepped into partisan politics. Now, I would like to know who that individual is. I will say for myself that I never, at a time when I was an organizer of the Industrial Workers of the World, mentioned the name of a political party, and the only reference that I ever made to political action was when I made the assertion that when the workers of this land are organized in an economic organization which must be based upon the class struggle, then they will of necessity see the necessity of political action and vote as they organize—a political unit. That is the only expression I have ever used. As an individual and speaking as an individual I have taken sides with political parties, but I am not accountable to this organization when I am speaking as an individual in the employ of no political party. If I was the one referred to, because I have made this statement many times, I want to know it. If I am not I would like to know who the individual is that has been referred to in that respect.

#### CLOSING PROCEEDINGS.

DEL. DUNCAN: As this seems to be under the head of "good and welfare," I move you that we hear from Fellow Worker De Leon on the good and welfare of the I. W. W. (Seconded.)

DEL. HAVER: Before Bro. De Leon speaks, which I suppose will wind up the convention, I would like to make a statement. I think something ought to be done by the different members or delegates when they get back home to their respective local unions. The first thing they should do is to call special meetings in their different locals, for this reason: Because I have found out that some of the reactionists have gone back home and are probably undermining us in the unions, or will in the next two or three weeks, it is necessary for us to show all about this matter at once and meet and answer these statements; because I know in the Industrial Council in New York they have gone out and have begun to fire already, and we should get back home and make these reports as soon as possible and deny all these statements.

DEL. RYAN: A point of order. We have passed a motion to call on Del. De Leon.

DEL. DE LEON (being called by the convention): Mr. Chairman, I cannot express to you how happy I have felt from the time this convention settled down to work down to now. For fifteen years I have been made a target of the foe, and they have incarnated in me all the virtues that I have been struggling for. More than once when this convention seemed to be in a tangle, when I saw the line of cleavage between the two sides, when I saw them wrestling for life, my thoughts went back to thirteen years ago. I had just returned from the International Socialist Congress held that year in the city of Zurich, in Switzerland. I was elected by D. A. 49 by the K. of L. on the G. E. B. of the K. of L. that was to meet in Philadelphia. That convention lasted two weeks. Upon my motion Terrence V. Powderly's seat was declared vacant, for the misappropriation of strike funds, but he clung to it until it went down. During that protracted struggle of a fortnight it became perfectly clear to me that the men with whom I was fighting to overthrow a crook in the labor movement, together with his

allies—that these men with whom I was struggling, who were my allies and I their ally—that those men were as big a set of crooks as the crook whom we were fighting. I was then thirteen years younger in age and in experience. I do not know how I would act to-day under similar circumstances. At that time I reasoned this way: “I realize that my allies are crooks, but it is just possible that if we can knock down one set of crooks, although it is done with a crooked club, that crooked club may by that effort become straight.” I failed. The crooks cannot be straightened. We are thirteen years further, and I want to tell you, you men that stood for the principles that we fought for and established here last year, that there is not one man on your side, that is on my side, that I can consider a crook. We have struggled here, an honest set, a sincere set, a determined set, sound because we are revolutionists, revolutionists because we are sound, and we overcame the crooks. There is that much progress in all the thirteen years. It is a progress of thirteen hundred years. This convention marks an epoch. It has been a straight-out fight between an element that has no conception of the labor movement and consequently is reactionary, and the progressive element—although I am sorry to say that among the latter there are more hot-headed men than there ought to be, but among masses you have all sorts of elements. On the whole, however, honesty of purpose characterizes our side of the question, and we have prevailed.

When I returned from Philadelphia thirteen years ago I returned with mixed feelings of joy and sorrow. When I return to my home to-night I return with unalloyed feelings of joy. Every man and woman of you who stood in this struggle—how clean you cut off the heads of the Shermans, the McCabes, the Kirkpatrick, the Cronins—you who established the principle of Industrial Unionism—all of you I take personally by the hand and tell you I am proud of having been in your company.

This fight is not ended. This fight is just begun. Perhaps I am not the oldest among you, nevertheless, my gray hairs cause people to take me for a very venerable patriarch, and I shall presume to speak as such when I address you at such times—feed your bodies and your minds. You St. Johns, you Heslewoods, you Tullars, you Coxes—all of you who have been in this fight, you have a great mission to fulfill. If you keep your bodies and your minds well fed you and I will live to see the day when on this soil of our well-beloved America—I say “beloved America” because though not usually, yet at times, I am sentimental—beloved America because it is the land in which we wooed our wives, and on which the cradles of our children have been rocked; it is a beloved America because, in the language of Marx, it rung the signal for the downfall of feudalism, and, if my reading of history is correct, the prophecy of Marx will be fulfilled and America will ring the downfall of capitalism the world over. It depends upon our work. We can do it.

Twenty years ago I was told that I was a visionary; that even what we have accomplished here could not be done in a thousand years. When I look back not only to those thirteen years, but to those twenty years, we have advanced centuries upon centuries. I do not remember exactly the language of the poet; if I had had any preparation for this call I would have hunted it up and refreshed my memory; but it is Clough who says:

Fear not the future is so dark;  
In front the sun climbs slow, O so slow!  
But westward look, the land lies bright.  
Perhaps in yon cloud of smoke concealed  
Your friends chase even now the foe,  
And but for you possess the field.

I know that what Marx teaches upon the instinct of the class struggle is correct; that the instinct is there; it is latent. It is the mission of the lieutenants of the capitalist class to interfere with us and to prevent us from touching that chord. It is our mission to break through and touch that chord, and that chord, if touched, responds immediately. But the capitalist class of this country walks upon a flaming volcano, and that volcano will start in eruption and overthrow them the day we have organized a substantial minority.

One correction, I think, to the Preamble was suggested to-day that sounded to me quite logical, or rather quite historically true. I wish to refer to it in connection with what I have just stated with regard to our chances. One critic—I think it was McIntosh—stated that it was a mistake to expect to organize ALL the workers. Ah, indeed, it is a mistake; only he did not carry his argument as far as I would have carried it. Not because you CANNOT organize all the workers, but because it is not NECESSARY to organize all the workers. The revolutions of this world have been accomplished not by majorities, but by minorities; only the minority had to be large enough, and earnest enough, and determined enough, and convinced enough to ACT. Soon as it had the numbers, just as soon as it had the numbers that raised it above a negligible quantity, just as soon as it was numerically strong enough, although but a small minority compared to the whole, its energy, its determination, its courage added to audacity, have always brought about the revolution.

Ex-Speaker Reed very correctly, and very much to the sorrow of his class, pointed out shortly before he died that if a vote had been taken, if a male vote or referendum had been taken, the colonies in this union would by a large majority have voted against independence. Correct. That revolution was accomplished by a clear-headed, determined minority. Between the minority that wants a certain thing and those who do not want it there lies a large mass of the "undetermined." Whether it will always be that way I do not know. It has always been that way, and will continue to be until some time after the co-operative commonwealth has been established. That minority must have fire enough in it—not straw fire, not kindling wood fire, but a fire that nothing can extinguish—to heat up and move that indifferent mass. And when that minority moves, the indifferent mass moves and is able to move the earth with the revolutionary minority. So that it lies in our hands, it lies in your hands when you leave this convention to carry this gospel of emancipation to the workers.

I look upon the man who says it will take hundreds of years to emancipate the working class as either a knave or a fool, and in such cases I know not which is the worse, the fool or the knave. The man who talks that way, whether he means to throw a cold blanket upon this movement, or whether he knows no better, is an enemy of the working class. The working class instinct is latent. That instinct can be awakened, and that instinct can be awakened only by that firm line of agitation that proceeds alone from well-established knowledge, and that nothing can shake. I have often been given credit for my undying enthusiasm. The fact is I have no enthusiasm. It takes no "enthusiasm" to say that two plus two make four and that if you

add two more to it it must make six, and it cannot make 222. It is not a case of "enthusiasm." If enthusiasm were all that animated me, that enthusiasm would long ago have burned me up, and I would now be in heaven playing on a golden harp—as we all hope to be and do. I have no enthusiasm except the enthusiasm that positive knowledge brings; that which brought me into the movement, and that which keeps me in the movement—the positive knowledge that this system is correct; that our system is correct; that our methods are correct, and that the emancipation of the working class can be accomplished within ten years.

Last year, seated in the rear of this very hall, one of the delegates to the convention, Clarence Smith, approached me and asked me: "Are you irrevocably set and committed to the theory of thirteen departments?" I said, "No, I will agree with you that we should have fewer if possible. But let us understand each other. Clarence Smith, do you believe it is visionary to say that ten years hence the capitalist class can be a thing of the past in this country?" He thought for about half a minute and he said: "No, I do not think it is visionary." "Well, then," said I, "we have agreed substantially." Since we are agreed substantially you will understand why it is that I want a smaller number of directive forces—an executive cannot be a large number. Consequently I am not set on thirteen departments. I would prefer if we had ten or five or two or one, because we would then have a head to the army that is to accomplish the revolution." Proceeding then upon this line, I have all along held, and to-day I am not ready to postpone the deliverance one day, one year. I stated "ten years" last year, and I now, a year later, say "nine years." It can be done, and it should be done, and it will be done if outside of this convention we display the earnestness that we have displayed within it.

It is said that a coward gets afraid before the danger, but the brave man after it. In that case we ought to be brave men, for we realize now the danger that we have escaped.

There is a Bible story to the effect that the arch fiend took Jesus on one occasion to the top of a mountain and showed him all the kingdoms of the world and said, "All these will I give unto you if you will bow down and worship me." The arch fiends of this movement gathered around Sherman, and they said to him, "All these myriads of working men will we give you if you bow down before us and put the revolutionists out of the I. W. W." Jesus said to the arch fiend, "Get thee behind me, Satan." Sherman succumbed. Sherman believed. Sherman proceeded upon that theory. I told Sherman in Newcastle, when he suggested things of this sort, "Sherman, we cannot if we would, and we would not if we could try to outfakir Gompers." The fool imagined that he could outfakir Gompers. He surrendered to the men who promised him myriads of working men in this organization, and has gone forth a disgraced man as we see him.

The danger was great. The conspiracy was deep laid. We see it appearing in the papers from Denver all the way across to New York. It was a conspiracy to squelch the revolution in this convention and to start over again an A. F. of L. If we consider the odds against us, the chairmanships in the hands of a few individuals with all preparations ready, whereas we, you all know, never held a caucus and never organized our forces—if we consider that, then we must admit that the danger was immense. Having escaped it we have double ground to be delighted.

I wish to close with this observation: All of us are fathers of children, or mothers of children, or have some aged relative who some-

how or other depends upon us. In other words, we are all human. Upon our work depends the establishment of that social system under which old age will enjoy the dignity of its years; under which womanhood will enjoy the dignity of her sex; under which childhood will enjoy the joys of its age. That future has been dreamed of by men whose hearts beat high, but the opportunity was not yet there because the material means to establish it were absent. Today the heart and the hand are abreast of each other. The instruments are ready at hand, and it will only be our fault if we fail to accomplish that desired solution.

The world looks to America. We have a duty towards ourselves. We have a duty towards other nations. It is not Russia, though she is doing much, it is not Germany; it is not France. The evolution of society has entrusted to free America, to the working class of America, with the liberation of the human race. That liberation is possible today. Capitalism has made it possible. Today all can be happy. The mentioning of this fact causes me to fall right back upon my favorite position, that of mathematics. Statistics have demonstrated beyond a doubt that if every male adult worked between the years of twenty-one and forty and if he worked only four hours a day, without any Saturday half holiday, but with Saturday and Sunday thrown out, with New Year thrown out as a holiday, with Lincoln's birthday, Decoration day, Arbor day, Thanksgiving day, election day, the Fourth of July and Christmas thrown out as holidays—if, in other words, every adult male worked only four hours a day 150 days a year, we could all enjoy an amount of wealth that today it would take \$10,000 to purchase. That is a granite rock of fact. So long as wealth was not produceable in quantities large enough to enable all to enjoy affluence, it was visionary to try to talk "universal happiness." That day has come, and when I speak of four hours a day 150 days in the year being able to yield every man, every adult an amount of wealth that today would take \$10,000 to purchase I am taking the minimum statistical estimate. Planted upon that fact, planted upon that other fact that the instinct of the class, of the working class, is there, who will deny that the emancipation of the working class depends upon the earnest, the resolute, the revolutionary men? And in parting to our homes let us all rely upon it that wherever one of us is found there will be found an apostle of the gospel that says, "We propose to raise the dome of the Co-operative Commonwealth, that commonwealth under which no slave shall bend the back." (Applause.)

**DEL. FRENCH:** As no more fitting closing can be given to this convention than the splendid summing up of Del. De Leon, I move you that this convention adjourn sine die, with three cheers for the Industrial Workers of the World and the emancipation of the working class. (Seconded.)

**THE CHAIRMAN:** Is there any objection? The Chair hears no objection. Therefore I declare the motion carried, and this convention now stands adjourned sine die.

With three cheers the second annual convention of the Industrial Workers of the World then adjourned sine die.

THE END.

## ADDENDA

---

The following is the complete poem from which Del. De Leon made a fragmentary quotation:

"SAY NOT THE STRUGGLE NAUGHT AVAILETH."

Say not the struggle naught availeth,  
The labor and the wounds are vain;  
The enemy faints not nor faileth,  
And as things have been they remain.

If hopes were dupes fears may be liars.  
It may be in yon smoke concealed  
Your comrades chase e'en now the fliers,  
And but for you possess the field.

For while the tired waves vainly breaking  
Seem here no painful inch to gain,  
Far back through creeks and inlets making  
Comes silent, flooding in, the main.

And not by eastern windows only  
When daylight comes comes in the light;  
In front the sun climbs, how slowly,  
But westward, look, the land is bright.

---

### MISSING RESOLUTIONS RESTORED.

#### No. 35.

Whereas, Paragraph 2 of the Preamble to our Constitution, as at present worded, emphasizes the "political field" above the "economic field" in the first clause, and is ambiguous in the latter clause, there being reasonable ground for a doubt as to whether the antecedent of "through" is "take" or "produce" and as to whether the antecedent of "without" is "organization" or "produce" or "take," and

Whereas, "That which they produce by their labor" may easily be so interpreted as not to include the machinery of production; be it therefore

Resolved, That paragraph 2 of the Preamble be amended so as to read: "Between these two classes a struggle must go on till the toilers come together on both the political field and the economic field, and take and hold the product of their labor through an economic organization of the working class not affiliated with any political party."

Submitted by

CARL H. DUNCAN,  
Representing L. U. 222,  
Spokane, Wash.

## No. 36.

Whereas, Paragraph 3 of the Preamble to our Constitution is loosely constructed and states an untruth in saying that because the trade unions "foster" a certain "state of things" the "rapid gathering of wealth" makes them "unable to cope;" for it is, in fact, their own internal structure that makes the trades unions inefficient; be it therefore

Resolved, That we amend paragraph 3 of the Preamble so as to read: "Through the rapid gathering of wealth and the centering of the management of industries into fewer and fewer hands the employing class have reared an ever-growing power, against which the trade union is utterly unavailing. When organized in trades unions, one set of workers is pitted against another set of workers in the same industry. This is the cause of the striker's ever-recurring defeat. The trade union aids the employing class to mislead the workers into the belief that they have interests in common with their employers."

Submitted by

CARL H. DUNCAN,  
Representing L. U. 222,  
Spokane, Wash.

## No. 37.

Whereas, It is unnecessary to mourn for the existence of an evil that can be removed; be it

Resolved, That in the first line of the fourth paragraph of the Preamble to our Constitution the word "sad" be stricken out.

Submitted by

CARL H. DUNCAN,  
Representing L. U. 222,  
Spokane, Wash.

## No. 37½.

Whereas, The worker's injury is a cause for working class action and not the result of it; be it

Resolved, That the last clause in the fourth paragraph of the Preamble to our Constitution be amended so as to read: "because an injury to one is an injury to all."

Submitted by

CARL H. DUNCAN,  
Representing L. U. 222,  
Spokane, Wash.  
October 3, 1906.

## NOTE.

A word of explanation is necessary regarding the financial reports of the general secretary-treasurer. During the year 1906 three complete financial reports were made, printed and circulated. The first, a thirty-two page pamphlet, covering all receipts and disbursements of the general office for the period beginning with July, 1905, and ending April, 1906, was issued May 1, 1906. The second was a similar report for May, 1906. The third was a similar report for June and July, 1906. No report for the month of August appeared for the reason that Executive Board Member John Riordan's services as bookkeeper were dispensed with at the time when work in connection with the approaching convention, supplementing the routine work of the office, was piling up

and the general secretary found it impossible to give it attention. All printed reports above mentioned were sent out, at the time they were completed, to all the local organizations and contained complete statements of all receipts and expenditures for the entire period indicated.

The above statement is made because of the persistent attempts of the reactionists to make it appear that no financial report whatever had been submitted by the secretary-treasurer.

By Order of Local Executive Board.

#### CORRECTION.

In the speech by Delegate Forberg, page 310, line 30, the passage "the first man to take up an appeal to the convention," should read: "The first man to bolt the convention," and so forth.

#### AMENDED PREAMBLE.

The working class and the employing class have nothing in common. There can be no peace so long as hunger and want are found among millions of working people and the few, who make up the employing class, have all the good things of life.

Between these two classes a struggle must go on until all the toilers come together on the political, as well as on the industrial field, and take and hold that which they produce by their labor through an economic organization of the working class, without affiliation with any political party.

The rapid gathering of wealth and the centering of the management of industries into fewer and fewer hands makes the trade union unable to cope with the ever-growing power of the employing class, because the trades unions foster a state of things which allows one set of workers to be pitted against another set of workers in the same industry, thereby helping defeat one another in wage wars. The trades unions aid the employing class to mislead the workers into the belief that the working class have interests in common with their employers.

These sad conditions can be changed and the interests of the working class upheld only by an organization formed in such a way that all its members in any one industry, or in all industries, if necessary, cease work whenever a strike or lockout is on in any department thereof, thus making an injury to one an injury to all.

Therefore, without endorsing or desiring the endorsement of any political party, we unite under the following constitution.

#### THE INDUSTRIAL UNION BULLETIN.

The official publication of the Industrial Workers of the World is "The Industrial Union Bulletin." Printed weekly, beginning March 2, 1907, the subscription is 50 cents a year. Office, 310 Bush Temple, Chicago. Ill. Remittances should be made payable to Wm. E. Trautmann, general secretary-treasurer.

#### VOTE ON SEATING R. T. SIMS.

YES—Smith, Johnson, Brown, Dressler, Cox, Forberg, Augustine, Fischer, Rugg, Markley, Richter, Goss, Shenkan, Veal, Dumas, Mul-lady, Goldberg, Ginther, Lingenfelter, Haver, Reid, Swerdfger, Gil-christ, Duncan, Hawkins, O'Donnell, McIntosh, Nordholdt, Juergens, Rogers, Lundy, McCue, Moore, Heslewood, Bohling, McDonald, Ryan, Dial, Rotkowitz, Kinneally, Fox, Eisenberg, Olsen, Maichele, Tullar, Schulz, Schweinburg, Hamerle, Hulse, Pelzott, Hauck, Jackson, Spear, Total vote, 343.



**NO**—Abbott. Hendricks, Hannemann, Kelly, Ahern, DeLeon, Moskowitz, Motherwell, Keogh, McKnight, Foote, Parks, Robinson, Petriella, McMullen, St. John, Riordan, McCabe, Kirkpatrick, Cronin, Mahoney, Trautmann. Frueh. Total vote, 260.

#### VOTE ON SEATING DELEGATES FROM TRANSPORTATION LOCALS.

**YES**—Holmes, Smith, DeLeon, Moskowitz, Johnson, Brown, Dressler, Cox, Forberg, Kleese, Augustine, Fischer, Rugg, Markley, Richter, Goss, Simpson, Shenkan, Veal, Goldberg, Ginther, Lingenfelter, Haver, Reid, Swerdfger, Gilchrist, Duncan, Hawkins, McIntosh, Parks, Nordholdt, French, Juergens, Robinson, Rogers, Lundy, McCue, Heslewood, Petriella, Bohling, St. John, Ryan, Riordan, Trautmann, Dial, Kinneally, Fox, Eisenberg, Olsen, Maichele, Tullar, Schulz, Schweinburg, Hamerle, Huelse, Rice, Pelzott, Sims, Hauck, Jackson, Frueh, Spear. Total vote, 379.

**NO**—Abbott, Hendricks, Hannemann, Smith, Kelly, Ahern, Keogh, McKnight, McMullen, McDonald, Kirkpatrick, Cronin, Sherman. Total vote, 246.

#### VOTE ON GIVING FITZGERALD VOTE FOR LOCAL NO. 185.

**YES**—Holmes, Hannemann, Kelly, DeLeon, Moskowitz, Johnson, Brown, Dressler, Cox, Kleese, Motherwell, Fischer, Rugg, Markley, Richter, Shenkan, Veal, Dumas, Mullady, Goldberg, Ginther, Lingenfelter, Haver, Reid, Foote, Duncan, Hawkins, McIntosh, Parks, Nordholdt, Juergens, Robinson, Lundy, McCue, Moore, Heslewood, Bohling, St. John, Ryan, Riordan, Trautmann, Rotkowitz, Kinneally, Fox, Olsen, Maichele, Tullar, Schulz, Schweinburg, Rice, Sims, Hauck, Jackson, Frueh, Leach, Stone, Pinkerton, Plummer, Hall, Desmond.

**NO**—Ahern, Keogh, McKnight, McMullen, McDonald, McCabe, Kirkpatrick, Cronin, Kohl, McKinnon, Schomberg.

#### VOTE ON MOTION TO ASSIST NEEDY DELEGATES.

**YES**—Holmes, Smith, DeLeon, Moskowitz, Johnson, Brown, Dressler, Cox, Forberg, Kleese, Motherwell, Augustine, Rugg, McKnight, Markley, Richter, Goss, Simpson, Shenkan, Veal, Mullady, Goldberg, Ginther, Lingenfelter, Haver, Reid, Foote, Duncan, Hawkins, McIntosh, Parks, Nordholdt, Juergens, Robinson, Rogers, Lundy, McCue, St. John, Ryan, Bohling, French, Riordan, Sherman, Dial, Rotkowitz, Kinneally, Fox, Olsen, Maichele, Tullar, Schweinburg, Rice, Pelzott, Sims, Hauck, Jackson, Frueh, Leach, Stone, Fitzgerald, Pinkerton, Desmond. Total vote, 378½.

**NO**—Hannemann, Kelly, Ahern, Fischer, Keogh, Doumas, Petriella, McMullen, McDonald, Kirkpatrick, Cronin, McKinnon. Total vote, 237½.

**NOT VOTING**—Abbott, Hendricks, Cranston, Swerdfger, O'Donnell, Moore, Heslewood, McCabe, Mahoney, Trautmann, Eisenberg, Schulz, Hamerle, Huelse, Spear, Kohl, Plummer, Hall, Schomberg.

#### VOTE ABOLISHING THE PRESIDENCY.

**YES**—Holmes, DeLeon, Moskowitz, Johnson, Dressler, Cox, Forberg, Kleese, Augustine, Fischer, Rugg, Markley, Richter, Goss, Shenkan, Veal, Mullady, Goldberg, Ginther, Lingenfelter, Reid, Foote, Duncan, Hawkins, McIntosh, Parks, Nordholdt, French, Juergens, Robinson, Rogers, Lundy, McCue, Moore, Heslewood, St. John, Ryan, Riordan, Trautmann, Rotkowitz, Kinneally, Fox, Maichele, Tullar, Schulz, Schweinburg, Rice, Pelzott, Sims, Hauck, Jackson, Frueh, Stone, Pinkerton, Fitzgerald, Desmond. Total vote, 354½.

**NO**—Abbott, Hannemann, Kelly, Ahern, Motherwell, Keogh, McKnight, McMullen, McDonald, Cronin, Kohl, McKinnon. Total vote, 253.

## VOTE TO ELECT CHAIRMAN.

**YES**—Holmes, DeLeon, Moskowitz, Johnson, Brown, Dressler, Cox, Forberg, Kleese, Augustine, Fischer, Rugg, Markley, Richter, Goss, Shenkan, Veal, Goldberg, Ginther, Lingenfelter, Haver, Reid, Foote, Duncan, Hawkins, McIntosh, Parks, Juergens, Robinson, Rogers, Lundy, Heslewood, St. John, Ryan, Riordan, Trautmann, Rotkowitz, Kinneally, Fox, Maichele, Tullar, Schweinburg, Hamerle, Rice, Pelzott, Sims, Hauck, Jackson, Frueh, Fitzgerald, Pinkerton, Plummer, Hall, French, Desmond. Total vote, 371.

**NO**—Hannemann, Kelly, Ahern, Motherwell, Keogh, McKnight, Moore, McMullen, McDonald, Cronin, Mahoney, Olsen, Hulse, McKinnon, Schomberg. Total vote, 251.

## VOTE AMENDING SECTION 1, ARTICLE 1.

**YES**—Holmes, DeLeon, Moskowitz, Johnson, Brown, Dressler, Cox, Forberg, Kleese, Motherwell, Augustine, Ahern, Fischer, Rugg, Markley, Richter, Goss, Shenkan, Veal, Dumas, Ginther, Lingenfelter, Haver, Reid, Foote, Hawkins, Parks, French, Robinson, Rogers, Lundy, McCue, Heslewood, Kleese, St. John, Ryan, Riordan, Cronin, Trautmann, Rotkowitz, Kinneally, Fox, Maichele, Tullar, Schulz, Schweinburg, Rice, Pelzott, Sims, Hauck, Jackson, Frueh, Stone, Pinkerton, Desmond.

**NO**—Abbott, Kelly, Keogh, McKnight, Mullady, Goldberg, Duncan, McMullen, McDonald, McCabe, Kirkpatrick, Sherman, McKinnon, Schomberg.

## VOTE ON APPEAL FROM THE CHAIR ON QUESTION OF NOMINATIONS FOR GENERAL SECRETARY-TREASURER.

**FOR SUSTAINING THE CHAIR**—Holmes, DeLeon, Moskowitz, Johnson, Brown, Cox, Forberg, Kleese, Augustine, Fischer, Rugg, Markley, Richter, Shenkan, Veal, Goldberg, Ginther, Lingenfelter, Haver, Reid, Foote, McIntosh, Parks, Nordholdt, French, Robinson, Rogers, McCue, Heslewood, St. John, Ryan, Riordan, Rotkowitz, Kinneally, Fox, Olsen, Tullar, Schulz, Schweinburg, Rice, Sims, Jackson, Frueh, Pinkerton, Fitzgerald, Hall.

**AGAINST**—McKnight, Duncan, Moore, Flaskamp, Kohl.

## VOTE ON NOMINATIONS FOR ASSISTANT GENERAL SECRETARY-TREASURER.

**FOR FOOTE**—DeLeon, Cox, Forberg, Markley, Richter, Veal, Ginther, St. John, Riordan, Trautmann, Olsen, Schweinberg, Rice. Total vote, 133.

**FOR KINNEALLY**—Holmes, Johnson, Brown, Keogh, Rugg, McKnight, Shenkan, Haver, Reid, Foote, McIntosh, French, Robinson, Lundy, McCue, Heslewood, Bohling, Rotkowitz, Fox, Sims, Jackson, Pinkerton, Fitzgerald. Total vote, 179.

**FOR DUNCAN**—Abbott, Hawkins, Moore, Schulz, Kohl. Total vote, 20.

**FOR HAGGERTY**—Moskowitz, Kleese, Augustine, Goldberg, Lingenfelter, Parks, Rogers, Ryan, Tuller, Frueh, Hall. Total vote, 128.

## VOTE ON AMENDMENT REDUCING PER CAPITA TAX TO 15¢ AND DUES OF MEMBERS-AT-LARGE TO 25¢ PER MONTH.

**YES**—Holmes, Moskowitz, Johnson, Cox, Augustine, Fischer, Rugg, McKnight, Markley, Richter, Shenkan, Veal, Goldberg, Ginther, Haver, Reid, McIntosh, Brown, Nordholdt, French, Robinson, Lundy, McCue, Moore, Heslewood, St. John, Rotkowitz, Kinneally, Tullar, Schulz, Schweinburg, Flaskamp, Rice, Sims, Jackson, Frueh, Fitzgerald, Plummer. Total vote, 309.

**NO**—Rogers, Ryan, Riordan. Total vote, 11.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

Absentees and Proxies—	19.
Appropriation for Delegates—	80, 95.
Arizona State Union—	474.
Auditing Committee—	246, 541, 579.
Authorization of Strikes—	375.
Benefit Insurance—	510.
Building Trades' Industrial Union—	11.
Business Agents—	554.
Committees—	12, 162, 163, 167.
Credentials Committee—	5, 24, 27, 29, 32, 35, 38, 96, 320, 398.
Constitution Committee—	13, 206, 275, 293, 304, 321, 327, 358, 429, 467, 472, 476, 524.
Committee on Organization—	384, 521, 552.
Committee on Good and Welfare—	571.
Committee on Strikes and Grievances—	367, 464.
Committee on Literature and Education—	393, 399, 402, 544, 550.
Committee on Reports of Officers—	365, 422, 596.
Committee on Ways and Means—	529.
Convention, Sovereign Power of—	415.
Constitution, Adoption of—	597.
Communications—	6, 40, 41, 42.
Correction of Minutes—	15, 17.
Closing Proceedings—	607.
Debate on Officers' Reports—	73, 80.
Delegates—	6, 7.
Disbursement of Funds—	602.
Dual Membership—	338.
Dues—	513, 598.
Election of Chairman—	249, 272.
Election of Officers—	475, 482.
Election of Editor—	600.
Finances—	425, 427.
General Executive Board—	488.
General Secretary-Treasurer, Duties of—	508.
Illinois Miners—	323.
Installation of Officers—	605.
Initiating a Referendum—	493.
Instructions to Organizers—	572.
Kirkpatrick Case—	291.
Local Executive Board—	360, 356.
Label—	448.
Members, Actual Wage-Workers—	344.
Minutes of General Executive Board—	95, 100, 126.
Metal and Machinery Department—	7, 8, 599.
Moyer-Haywood and General Strike—	411.
Organization Funds—	318.
Organizers in Conventions—	564. ,
Place of Next Convention—	600.
Political Endorsement—	316, 420, 432, 545.
Preamble—	573.
Representation of Locals—	335.

Representation, Basis of—502.  
 Recruits, Education of—294.  
 Reports of National Officers—39, 42, 73, 96, 99, 132.  
 Report of Ritual Committee—567.  
 Resolutions—95, 156, 167, 175, 188, 205, 355, 387, 396, 409, 421, 551.  
 Seceding Delegates—484.  
 Status of C. O. Sherman—401.  
 Sick and Death Benefits—566.  
 Stenographic Report—13.  
 Structure of Organization—442.  
 Terms of Salutation—418.  
 Tobacco Workers' Strike—372.  
 Transfer of Votes—175.  
 Transportation Department—7, 9, 533, 598.  
 Western Federation of Miners—8.  
 Window Washers' Case—301, 464.

## INDEX TO SPEAKERS

Augustine, P.—11, 76, 297, 348, 360, 511, 535.  
 Cox, W. W.—37, 93, 127, 227, 261, 285, 347, 386, 555, 606.  
 Cranston, F.—184.  
 Cronin, F. W.—30, 33, 34, 35, 36, 40, 79, 141, 180, 222, 243, 292.  
 DeLeon, Daniel—5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 16, 34, 39, 73, 74, 164, 207, 219, 225,  
 231, 240, 250, 276, 295, 300, 330, 332, 337, 339, 362, 388, 390, 392, 417,  
 431, 436, 493, 496, 547, 595, 607.  
 Duncan, C. H.—13, 19, 83, 88, 183, 213, 258, 280, 284, 287, 338, 352, 414,  
 419, 429, 438, 448, 493, 495, 499, 509, 536, 538, 543, 545, 565, 570.  
 Eisenberg, M.—30.  
 Fischer, E.—444, 522, 569.  
 Fitzgerald, J. E.—28, 343, 381, 515.  
 Foote, E. J.—310.  
 Forberg, Lillian—93, 310, 370, 378, 470, 517.  
 Fox, W. R.—24, 177, 184, 258, 457, 476.  
 Francis, John M.—323.  
 French, S. J.—228, 245, 285, 296, 400, 478, 518, 545, 564, 568, 598.  
 Frueh, U.—538.  
 Goldberg, L.—78, 307, 351, 448, 455, 469.  
 Hall, W. L.—279, 282, 293, 303, 332, 341, 443.  
 Hannemann, W. J.—8, 10, 17, 19, 92, 258.  
 Haver, F. W.—22, 278, 379, 458, 474, 607.  
 Heslewood, F. W.—256, 257, 345, 501.  
 Holmes, G.—88, 222, 286, 368, 369, 449, 496, 514, 526, 537.  
 Johnson, J. W.—25, 218, 287.  
 Kehoe, Wm.—13, 20, 80, 87, 262.  
 Kiefe—308.  
 Kinneally, J. J.—5, 78, 206, 224, 236, 277, 283, 505, 524.  
 Kirkpatrick, C. G.—7, 8, 176, 210, 211, 288.  
 Kleese, F. W.—9, 277, 286, 370, 459, 492, 505.  
 Kohl, L. M.—10, 351.  
 Lingenfelter, A.—19, 20, 81, 212, 224, 372, 451, 479, 515, 527, 537.  
 Lundy, E. U.—277, 473, 509.  
 Mahoney, C. E.—11, 18, 24, 27, 142, 215, 229, 259, 341, 430, 432, 484.  
 Markley, E. R.—5, 456.

- McCabe, F.—8, 10, 15, 17, 25, 146, 152, 155, 213.  
 McCue, W. E.—221, 283.  
 McDonald, P. R.—75, 77, 220, 454.  
 McIntosh, A. L.—277, 311, 574.  
 McKinnon, D.—94, 225, 238, 277, 371.  
 McMullen, John—14, 25, 29, 32, 73, 74, 81, 90, 91, 154, 157, 165, 175,  
 177, 209, 210, 217, 227, 237, 254, 329, 335, 363, 372, 389, 390, 391, 402,  
 403, 404, 417, 419, 424, 428, 432, 439, 443, 459, 484.  
 Moore, F. G.—8, 11, 260, 306, 312, 332, 350, 406, 449, 512, 517, 574.  
 Moskowitz, P.—151, 280, 295, 299, 371, 385, 451, 562, 564.  
 Motherwell, J.—211.  
 Parks, Wade—18, 25, 28, 38, 40, 78, 85, 139, 153, 158, 165, 176, 217, 218,  
 225, 290, 297, 307, 322, 336, 340, 403, 413, 416, 458, 480, 489, 510, 546,  
 555, 563, 595.  
 Petriella, T.—135, 348, 394, 408.  
 Pinkerton, W. J.—278, 568, 605.  
 Reid, J. M.—230, 382, 453, 532.  
 Richter, H.—13, 235, 309, 445, 456, 504, 516, 603.  
 Riordan, John—9, 22, 132, 139.  
 Rogers, W. J.—90, 283, 342.  
 Rotkowitz, Sol.—374, 531.  
 Ryan, A.—36, 39, 76, 84, 89, 95, 159, 160, 162, 347, 350, 361, 362, 395,  
 419, 433, 440, 450, 461, 476, 479, 481, 506.  
 Schweinburg, P.—181, 216, 278, 303, 306, 322, 342, 366, 368, 391, 447,  
 468, 502, 512, 537, 601.  
 Shenkan, I.—5, 248, 346, 423, 505, 597.  
 Sherman, C. O.—5, 9, 10, 14, 37, 42, 75, 96, 143, 148, 150, 215, 233, 266.  
 Sims, R. T.—8, 15, 31, 87, 213, 223, 340, 349, 391, 452, 514, 600, 602,  
 Smith, A. L.—89.  
 St. John, V.—166, 210, 504.  
 Stone, B.—221.  
 Trautmann, W. E.—22, 77, 126, 127, 128, 129, 144, 304, 318, 373, 375,  
 532, 603.  
 Tullar, W. E.—212, 227, 308, 452, 496, 536, 607.  
 Veal, P.—222, 298, 359, 381, 535, 601.

